DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 572 AC 006 700

AUTHOR	Boice, Robert Andrew
TITLE	A Study of the Knowledge and Attitudes Held by County Extension Lay Leaders and Members Relative to the 1966 Reorganization of the Cooperative Extension Association of Jefferson County, New York.
INSTITUTION	Virginia Polytechnic Inst., Blacksburg.
PUB DATE	May 68
NOTE	120p.; M.S. Thesis
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$6.10
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrative Organization, Adult Leaders, Age Differences, *Analysis of Variance, *Attitudes, Educational Background, Females, Income, Investigations, *Knowledge Level, Males, Masters Theses, Occupations, Participation, Residential Patterns, *Rural Extension, Tenure
IDENTIFIERS	*Cooperative Extension Service, New York State

ABSTRACT

Objectives of this study were to determine knowledge levels and attitudes among lay leaders and members concerning the Cooperative Extension Service (CES) reorganization in Jefferson County, New York; relationships between knowledge and attitudes; and the relation of knowledge levels and attitudes to certain variables. An interview schedule was administered to all 36 leaders in the county and to 116 members (a 5% sample). Findings included the following: (1) leaders had higher knowledge levels and more favorable attitudes than members; (2) Extension participation was higher for leaders than for members; (3) in the member group, women were more favorable toward the reorganization; (4) attitudes and knowledge were not significantly related to one another; (5) age, education, occupation, income, tenure in Extension, residence, and Extension participation were not signficantly related to knowledge of the reorganization or to attitudes held concerning it. (Author/LY)

ED038572

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

A STUDY OF THE KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDES HELD BY COUNTY EXTENSION LAY LEADERS AND MEMBERS RELATIVE TO THE 1966 REORGANIZATION OF THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION ASSOCIATION OF JEFFERSON COUNTY, NEW YORK

by

Robert Andrew Boice

Thesis submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the

Virginia Polytechnic Institute

in partial fulfillment for the degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in

Extension Education

APPROVED:

Chairman Dr. Paul J. Moore

Dr. George T. Blume

Dr. Maynard C. Heckel

May, 1968

Blacksburg, Virginia

AC 006 700

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
TITLE PAGE	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
LIST OF TABLES	vi
Chapter	
I INTRODUCTION	1
New York State Extension Reorganization	3
Purpose of Study	5
Research Problem and Objectives	6
Scope of Study	7
Definition of Terms	8
II REVIEW OF LITERATURE	10
Introduction	10
Concept of Knowledge	10
Concept of Participation	12
Concept of Attitude (Opinion)	15
Information From Related Studies	17
III METHODOLOGY	22
Population	22
Sampling	23
Interview Schedule Development	25
Method of Scoring Participation	26
Method of Scoring Knowledge	27

Chapter		Page
	Method of Scoring Attitude	28
	Collection of Data	29
	Pre-test	30
	Tabulation and Analysis of Data	30
	Evaluation and Criticism of Methodology	32
IV	GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS AND LEVEL OF EXTENSION PARTICIPATION OF THE LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS	34
	Personal Characteristics	34
	Extension Participation	44
V	LEADERS' AND MEMBERS' KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDE OF THE EXTENSION REORGANIZATION	47
	Knowledge Response	47
	Opinion Response	53
	Relationship of Variables Identified in the Study	59
VI	SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS	68
	Summary of Findings	68
	Recommendations and Implications	72
	Suggestions for Further Research	73
BIBLIOGRAPHY		74
APPENDICES		77
A	Instructions for Interviewers	78
B	Statement of Purpose for Interviewers	81
C	Interviewing Procedures and Techniques Used in Interviewer Orientation	84
D	Interview-Schedule	93
VITA		110

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author wishes to express his appreciation to Dr. Paul J. Moore, chairman of his graduate committee, for the counsel and guidance given throughout his graduate research and study, and to Dr. Maynard C. Heckel and Dr. George T. Blume, members of his graduate committee for their assistance and advice with his research project.

Appreciation is extended by the author to the Board of Directors of the Cooperative Extension Association of Jefferson County and to the Director and staff of the New York State Cooperative Extension Service for granting the author a sabbatical leave to pursue graduate study.

He is sincerely grateful to Mrs. Geraldine C. Fink, Jefferson County Cooperative Extension Agent, for assuming the administrative duties and responsibilities of the author's Extension position while on sabbatical leave and for coordinating and overseeing the interviewing for the research project.

A special thank you to all members of the Jefferson County Extension agent staff for contributing the time and effort to conduct the interviews for the research project and to all of the lay Extension leaders and members for their cooperation and interest in completing the interview schedule.

He wishes to thank Mrs. Belva March and Mrs. Mary Hermann for their able secretarial assistance with the research project and Mrs. Pat Wornom for her excellent job in typing the final draft of the thesis.

The author will be forever grateful to his wife, Mary, for her encouragement, understanding, and assistance during his graduate study. To his son, Randy, and daughter, Kathy, thanks for helping Dad through graduate school.

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
I	COMPOSITION OF LAY MEMBER SAMPLE	24
II	METHOD OF SCORING PARTICIPATION	27
III	METHOD OF SCORING ATTITUDE	28
IV	LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS CLASSIFIED BY AGE	35
V	LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS CLASSIFIED BY EDUCATIONAL LEVEL	36
VI	LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS CLASSIFIED BY SEX	37
VII	LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS CLASSIFIED BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE	39
VIII	LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS CLASSIFIED BY OCCUPATION	40
IX	LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS CLASSIFIED BY INCOME	42
X	LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS CLASSIFIED BY TENURE OF MEMBERSHIP IN EXTENSION	43
XI	LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS CLASSIFIED BY LEVEL OF EXTENSION PARTICIPATION	45
XII	COMPARISON OF LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS RELATIVE TO LEVELS OF EXTENSION PARTICIPATION	46
XIII	RESPONSES BY LEADERS AND MEMBERS TO KNOWLEDGE QUESTIONS #1 THROUGH #6	48
XIV	RESPONSES BY LEADERS AND MEMBERS TO KNOWLEDGE QUESTIONS #7 THROUGH #12	49
XV	RESPONSES BY LEADERS AND MEMBERS TO KNOWLEDGE QUESTIONS #13 THROUGH #18	50
XVI	LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS CLASSIFIED BY LEVEL OF KNOWLEDGE OF THE EXTENSION REORGANIZATION	52
XVII	RELATIONSHIP OF LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS LEVELS OF KNOWLEDGE OF THE EXTENSION REORGANIZATION	53
XVIII	RESPONSES BY LEADERS AND MEMBERS TO OPINION STATEMENTS #1 THROUGH #5 ON THE EXTENSION REORGANIZATION	54

Table		Page
XIX	RESPONSES BY LEADERS AND MEMBERS TO OPINION STATEMENTS #6 THROUGH #10 ON THE EXTENSION REORGANIZATION	55
XX	RANK ORDER COMPARISON OF LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS OPINION RESPONSES IN TERMS OF AGREEMENT	57
XXI	LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS CLASSIFIED BY LEVEL OF OPINION OF THE EXTENSION REORGANIZATION	58
XXII	RELATIONSHIP OF LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS LEVELS OF OPINION OF THE EXTENSION REORGANIZATION	59
XXIII	RELATIONSHIP OF LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS LEVELS OF KNOWLEDGE TO LEVELS OF OPINION OF THE EXTENSION REORGANIZATION	60
XXIV	RELATIONSHIP OF EXTENSION PARTICIPATION BY LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS TO THEIR KNOWLEDGE OF THE EXTENSION REORGANIZATION	61
XXV	RELATIONSHIP OF EXTENSION PARTICIPATION OF LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS TO THEIR ATTITUDE TOWARD THE EXTENSION REORGANIZATION	62
XXVI	RELATIONSHIP OF THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES OF AGE, EDUCATION, SEX, AND OCCUPATION TO THE LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS KNOWLEDGE OF THE EXTENSION REORGANIZATION.	63
XXVII	RELATIONSHIP OF THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES OF INCOME, RESIDENCE, AND TENURE TO THE LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS KNOWLEDGE OF THE EXTENSION REORGANIZATION	64
XXVIII	RELATIONSHIP OF THE VARIABLES OF AGE, EDUCATION, SEX, AND OCCUPATION TO THE LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS OPINION OF THE EXTENSION REORGANIZATION	66
XXIX	RELATIONSHIP OF THE VARIABLES OF INCOME, RESIDENCE, AND TENURE TO THE LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS OPINION OF THE EXTENSION REORGANIZATION	67

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A dynamic characteristic of the modern world is rapid change. Society is continuously confronted with many forms of change - technological, social, economic and cultural. Since the turn of the century the contributions made by science and research to man's body of knowledge have increased at a phenomenal rate. This advancement of knowledge coupled with the increase in the level of education of the masses has brought a dramatic acceleration of changes. The passing of each decade finds the tempo of change even greater than the previous decade and looking at the future there is every indication that the degree and rapidity of change will be even greater.

The Cooperative Extension Service during its 53 years of existence has made a continued effort to adjust to change. These efforts to develop and implement new educational programs to meet the needs of the people being served has resulted in the development of many new Extension programs and approaches. The development of new programs has often necessitated making changes in the Extension organization. Change in objectives, clientele, size of staff, the bases of developing programs, the bases of authority and financial support are some of the major factors contributing to changes in the organization.[1]

It is generally recognized that if the Extension organization is to continue to fulfill its basic objectives of helping people to

---

[1] H. C. Sanders, The Cooperative Extension Service (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966), p. 43.

recognize, analyze and solve their problems, it must continue to adapt to the changing needs and demands of today's people. The Scope Report of 1958, states "Programs and procedures appropriate and adequate yesterday are likely to be inappropriate today - and obsolete tomorrow."[2]

During the past five years greater emphasis has been placed on Extension's involvement in public affairs and resource development programs. At the same time there has been increased recognition of the need for university-wide Extension programs to adequately serve the American community.

In several states, Cooperative Extension has assumed these broader roles in program effort and in assuming these roles has found that the disciplines of the agricultural and home economics colleges, although adequate in the past, needed to be supplemented by information from other colleges of the university. In addition, due to the nature and scope of these new programs, the need was seen to depart from the traditional organizational arrangement on both the state and county level and move toward an area and regional basis of administration with greater use of program specialist personnel. The broader and more diversified programs have required a broader resource and organizational base and consequently has led some states to reorganize their organizational system.

---

[2]Federal Extension Service, The Cooperative Extension Service . . . TODAY, A Report Prepared by Subcommittee on Scope and Responsibility (Washington, D. C.: Federal Extension Service, 1958), p. 7.

New York State Extension Reorganization

On May 1, 1963 a special State committee of both lay and professional people involved in the New York State Cooperative Extension program embarked on a study of the administration and programs of the State Extension Organization. The special study committee placed particular emphasis on the questions and problems concerned with Extension's future. The study involved three major phases.[3]

(1) Examination and discussion of Extension's resources and possible contributions in the present and future.

(2) Identification of primary audiences as a basis for developing Cooperative Extension programs.

(3) Examination of the organizational structure and development of three organizational plans with the incorporation of alternatives for the consideration of lay leaders and professional Extension workers.

On September 1, 1964 the study committee submitted its report and outlined a new organizational plan with recommendations for adoption and implementation. On May 14, 1964 the Central Advisory Committee[4] unanimously accepted the report and recommended that the Director of

---

[3]New York State Cooperative Extension Service, Report of the Study Committee on an organization plan for Cooperative Extension in New York State. (Ithaca, N.Y.: New York State Cooperative Extension Service, 1964) p. 3.

[4]See definition of terms for explanation of this and other terms at the end of this chapter.

Extension initiate action to implement the plan as presented in the report. Subsequently the reorganization plan was presented to the Extension professional staff and to the county Extension boards of directors.

In presenting the proposed reorganization plan to the county Extension boards of directors, Dr. A. A. Johnson, Director of the New York State Cooperative Extension Service, stated:

> The Cooperative Extension Service of New York State must adapt its teaching program and its organization to meet the changes in character and needs of the people for whom it exists.
>
> Due to its dynamic educational work, there is urgent need for an increased rate and new order of transformation in Cooperative Extension. This is mandated by the knowledge explosion and increasing demands placed on Extension by its present and potential audiences.[5]

During the Spring of 1965 solicitation was made to all counties for volunteers to initiate the reorganization plan with the understanding that six counties would be selected as pilot counties to begin reorganizing. Jefferson County was one of the six counties selected and during the last six months of 1965 the county Extension board of directors proceeded to appoint a steering committee to draw up a new constitution and by-laws and make selections concerning various options provided in the reorganization plan. Recommendations made by the steering committee were acted upon by the county Extension board of directors. The proposed county organizational plan developed by the steering committee was approved by the board of directors for presentation to the Extension membership at the

---

[5] New York State Cooperative Extension Service, op. cit., p. 1.

annual meeting on November 22, 1965. The membership present at the annual meeting voted to approve the new constitution and by-laws as proposed. On January 1, 1966 the new organization plan became effective in Jefferson County and has been in operation for over fifteen months at the time of this study.

Purpose of Study

The planning, implementation and resulting effectiveness of the County Extension organization and programs is primarily dependent on the acceptance and interest of the lay people, especially the lay leaders and members of the County Extension Association. Under the New York State Extension system the lay leaders as elected representatives of the lay Extension membership play a key role in the operations of the County Extension Association. Serving as members of the Association Board of Directors, they have a major responsibility in making decisions concerning the administration and functioning of the County organization.

In consideration of the responsibility and involvement of the lay leaders and members in the Association it is important that they have a reasonable knowledge and understanding of the Extension organization and that there be a favorable organizational rapport. Since the implementation of the reorganization plan there have been questions posed by both lay persons and the Extension staff concerning the general understanding held by the lay membership regarding the new organization. The purpose of this study will be to investigate the extent of knowledge and the nature of opinions held by the lay leaders and members of the new organization.

Present plans are to complete the reorganization of all county Extension organizations by 1970. By the time this study is completed less than half of the counties will be reorganized. The information gained from this study should be of value in the following three areas.

(1) Assisting in the reorganization process of the remaining county Extension organizations.

(2) Identifying areas in need of strengthening relative to the operation of the Jefferson County Extension Organization.

(3) Assist in the reorganization process of other non-Extension organizations similar to the one under study.

Research Problem and Objectives

The research problem is to determine the levels of knowledge and opinion of the lay members and leaders with regard to the 1966 Extension reorganization in Jefferson County with emphasis on the following major objectives:

(1) Determine the knowledge held by lay members' and lay leaders' of the new Extension organization.

(2) Determine the opinions held by the lay members and lay leaders of the new Extension organization.

(3) Determine the relationship of the lay members and lay leaders knowledge of the new organization to their opinion of the new organization.

(4) Determine the relationship of the lay members' and lay leaders' level of participation to:

A. Level of knowledge

B. Opinion

(5) Identify any significant relationships involving the following factors with regard to the knowledge and opinions held by the lay members and lay leaders.

A. Age

B. Formal Education

C. Sex

D. Occupation

E. Income

F. Residence

G. Tenure

Scope of Study

The scope of this study will be limited to the lay members and lay leaders of the Cooperative Extension Association of Jefferson County, New York. A sample of lay members was drawn from the active Extension membership on record as of January 1, 1966. The entire population of lay leaders serving terms of office during 1966 and 1967 were used in the study. All information was obtained by personal interviews conducted by nine Extension Agents on the Jefferson County Extension Staff.

Definition of Terms

Association - The Cooperative Extension Association of Jefferson County.

Attitude (opinion) - The expression of a person's feelings, beliefs and understanding based on answers to questions stated in the interview schedule used in this study.

Board of Directors - The governing body of the Cooperative Extension Association in each county composed of lay leaders elected by the lay Extension membership.

Central Advisory Committee - A State Extension committee serving in an advisory capacity on the purpose and conduct of Cooperative Extension work in New York State. The committee is composed of 20 lay Extension leaders representing the five Extension districts in the State and 10 persons representing the Extension professional staff including one representative from each of the Extension Agent Associations (4-H, Agriculture and Home Economics), one Extension specialist from the College of Agriculture, one Extension specialist from the College of Home Economics, the State 4-H Club Leader, the State Leader of County Agriculture Agents, the State Leader of Home Demonstration Agents, the Director and Associate Director of Extension.[6]

---

[6] L. R. Simons, The Extension Service Partnership With County Supporting Agencies in New York 1911 - 1961 (Ithaca, New York: New York State Cooperative Extension Service, 1962), Appendix.

Division - A program division of the Association - i.e. Agriculture, Home Economics or 4-H Divisions.

Division Executive Committee - A program development committee for each program division (Agriculture, Home Economics and 4-H) composed of persons elected by the Extension lay membership. The committee is directly responsible to the County Extension Board of Directors.

Knowledge - A statement of fact indicating what is known to be true or correct substantiated by documentive proof, - in this study the Constitution and by-laws of the Cooperative Extension Association of Jefferson County.

Lay Extension Leader (leader) - A person elected by the County Extension membership to be a member of the Board of Directors or Division Executive Committee.

Lay Extension Member (member) - A resident of Jefferson County, 18 years of age or older, currently enrolled in the Agriculture, Home Economics or 4-H Division programs for the purpose of receiving information or participating in activities sponsored by the Cooperative Extension Association of Jefferson County.

Participation - refers to an individual's personal involvement in any Extension activity or event based on the six criteria used in this study explained in Chapter III.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Introduction

This chapter will discuss three major areas of concern in this study: knowledge, participation and attitudes. A concept of each term, based on literature cited, will be defined according to its application in the study.

Available research references including the "Biological and Agricultural Indexes" and the "Review of Extension Research" did not identify any parallel studies directly concerned with the problem under investigation. However, parts of other studies involving Cooperative Extension and other organizations provided information relevant to some of the factors considered. Findings obtained from related research studies are reported in the final portion of this chapter.

Concept of Knowledge

The search to obtain a satisfactory answer to the question, "What is knowledge?" has perplexed mankind for centuries dating back to the time of the Greek scholars, Plato and Aristotle. The word "knowledge" encompasses several meanings and many definitions of the term were found in literature reviewed. Some writers on the subject defined knowledge simply as that which is known. Dewey and Bentley[1] rather than defining the word refer to knowledge as knowns and knowings.

---

[1]John Dewey and Arthur F. Bentley, Knowing and the Known. (Boston: The Beacon Press, 1949), p. 48.

Although these definitions are satisfactory in a limited extent it is necessary to consider the elements of knowledge in order to develop a reference point for the purpose of knowledge measurement useful for this study.

The following definition offered by Webster identifies many of the meanings and elements of knowledge:

> - Familiarity gained by actual experience; practical skill; technical acquaintance; as, a knowledge of life. The act or state of understanding; clear perception of fact or truth; familiar cognizance; conginition. Knowledge acquired by the sense or by feeling or by intuition. . .knowledge obtained by intellectual processes of abstration and comparison . . .that which is gained and preserved by knowing; instruction; enlightment; learning, also, broadly the sum of information conserved by civilization; - often personnified.[2]

A definition of knowledge offered by Russell states:

> "We may. . .say that what is known consists, first of certain matters of fact and certain principles of inference, neither of which stands in need of extraneous evidence, and secondly, of all that can be ascertained by applying the principle of inference to the matters of fact. Traditionally, the matters of fact are those given in perception and memory, while the principles of inference are those of deductive and inductive logic."[3]

Identified in both of these broad definitions is the element of fact, that is, what is true. This element of knowledge is used as a basis for measurement in this study. The facts are those points of

---

[2] Webster's New International Dictionary, Second Edition (Springfield, Mass.: G. & C. Merriman Co., 1934).

[3] Bertrand R. Russell, Human Knowledge, Its Scope and Limits (New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1948), p. 155.

information found in the statements set forth in the Jefferson County Cooperative Extension Association's constitution and by-laws as adopted for the new organization. For the purpose of this study knowledge is based on those matters of fact recalled and reported by the individual respondent relative to the new Extension organization that are known to be true.

In using "facts" as defined above as a basis for measuring knowledge, the knowledge test used in the interview schedule is designed to obtain a measurement of what the members report to be correct - their knowledge of what are the facts including: that which is known by the respondent and is true; that which is known and is false; and that which is not known.

Concept of Participation

Participation can be viewed as both a problem and an attribute common to both formal and voluntary organizations. If any organization is to successfully achieve its objectives and goals it will be confronted with the problem of obtaining satisfactory involvement and contributions from its members and leaders. Voluntary organizations, in contrast with formal organizations, are restricted in their efforts to influence participation since they lack the assistance of coercive power (legal enforcement) and purchasing power (salaries and wages).[4]

---

[4]W. Keith Warner, "Problems in Participation," Journal of Cooperative Extension, Vol. III, No. 4 (Winter 1965), p. 220.

Many of the problems of participation have originated in the common misconception of this term held by many people. As pointed out by Alpert and Smith:

> Despite verbal disclaimers, participation is often regarded merely in a carrying-out sense, where decisions are made largely from above and plans of action and policy are thoroughly "worked out at the top level" while "lower" levels are used merely as manpower to carry them out. . . where this limited role persists for any length of time, the individual is not participating. He is not an organic part of the group, but merely an agent of the group along with a number of other agents. Moreover, the requisite consequence of participation is missing: the individual does not grow and his activity is not a creative one.[5]

Allport explains that measurements of participation are often made in terms of activity which is only a part of participation. An individual must become "ego-involved" if there is to be true participation. In addition Allport makes the point that "when ego is not effectively engaged the individual becomes reactive."[6]

Continuing with this latter point by Allport, Spicer considers participation a working tool for action useful in preventing resistance that is not related to the change itself and helpful in establishing conditions for orderly and constructive change.[7]

---

[5]Burt Alpert and Patricia A. Smith, "How Participation Works," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. V, No. 1 (Winter 1949), p. 3.

[6]S. D. Hoslett, (ed.), Human Factors in Management (Parkville, Mo.: Park College Press, 1946), pp. 256 - 260.

[7]Edward H. Spicer, (ed.), Human Problems in Technological Change (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1952), p. 293.

Participation in any organization is evidenced in many forms: affiliation or membership; meeting attendance; involvement in activities and programs in meetings; volunteering for special assignments for the group, making financial contributions and exercising leadership responsibilities.[8]

Evan identifies three dimensions of participation: decision-making, activity and value commitment. The decision-making dimension is defined as the action taken by the rank-and-file members concerning the formal policy-making process and operating practices of the organization. The activity dimension involves the actions implementing the objectives and decisions of an organization including utilizing the organization's facilities or services. Value commitment refers to the "effectively-involved" acceptance of the principles, purposes or goals of an organization. In regard to this last dimension, Evan states, "The dimensions of decision-making and activity presuppose a set of goals or values to which a member is committed."[9]

In consideration of the above information, two requisites were identified for inclusion in measuring participation for this study. The first requisite involved the measurement of participation denoted by membership and attendance. The second requisite involved the measurement of participation denoted by committee involvement, leadership activities and the utilization or organization services. In

---

[8]Warner, op. cit., p. 220.

[9]William M. Evan, "Dimensions of Participation in Voluntary Associations," Social Forces, Vol. 36, No. 2 (December 1957), pp. 148 - 153.

establishing these two requisites for participation measurement both the "activity" and "ego-involvement" factors described by Allport are included in the measurement. It is recognized by the author that the amount of "ego-involvement" may be in some cases only superficial depending on the depth of interest and commitment by the individual which could not be accurately measured in this investigation.

Concept of Attitude (Opinion)

Although these two terms, attitude and opinion are not synomynous, they are discussed together here because they are closely interrelated.

As defined by Krech and Crutchfield an attitude is "an enduring organization of motivational, emotional, perceptional and cognitive process with respect to some aspect of the individual's world.[10]

Remmers considers a working concept of an attitude, "as an affectively toned idea or group of ideas predisposing the organism to action with reference to specific attitude objects."[11] In addition he develops the relationship between attitude and opinion by stating:

> In most measurement of attitudes we are really measuring opinions. Opinions, therefore, are expressed attitudes.[12]

---

[10] D. Krech and R. S. Crutchfield, Theory and Problems of Social Psychology, (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1948), p. 152.

[11] H. H. Remmers, Introduction to Opinion and Attitude Measurement (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954), p. 3.

[12] op. cit., p. 7.

Best defines attitude and explains the relationship between attitude and opinion in the following statements:

> How an individual feels or what he believes, is his attitude. But it is difficult, if not impossible, to describe and measure attitude. The researcher must depend upon what the individual says as to his beliefs or feelings. This is the area of opinion. Through the use of questions, or by getting an individual's expressed reaction to statements, a sample of his opinion is obtained. From this statement of opinion may be inferred or estimated his attitude - what he really believes.[13]

DeFleur and Westie identified twenty-three different definitions of attitude ranging from a simple definition of tendencies toward overt action to the complex definition of a "sum total of inclinations, feelings, notions, ideas, fears, prejudices, threat and convictions about any specific topic."[14]

For the purpose of this study, attitude will be considered as the individual's feelings or beliefs held toward a certain object or subject. The subject in this case is the major points of change created through the reorganization of the County Extension Service.

Attitude measurement will be based on the opinions offered by the respondents to several questions concerning the reorganization. Opinions are the verbal expression of the respondents attitude.

---

[13]John W. Best, Research in Education, (Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959), p. 155.

[14]Melvin L. DeFleur & Frank R. Westie, "Attitude as a Scientific Concept," Social Forces, Vol. 42, No. 1 (October 1963), p. 20.

Information From Related Studies

As noted in the beginning of this chapter the author was unable to find any parallel studies dealing directly with the reorganization of a county Cooperative Extension Association. However, on reviewing some research studies concerned with perception and participation it was determined that these studies would assist in providing a frame of reference for the present study.

Although this study does not involve the broad concept of perception it does focus on factors of perception - attitude and knowledge. Both of these factors were identified either directly or indirectly by the perception studies reviewed. In this regard, some of the variables used and conclusions obtained through the perception studies were considered relevant.

Blalock, Greenwood and Abraham[15] in summarizing the points of view found in seminar papers presented by eight eminent persons[16] as

---

[15] T. C. Blalock, Mary Nell Greenwood and Roland H. Abraham, "What the Public Thinks of Extension," Journal of Cooperative Extension, Vol. 1, No. 1 (Spring 1963), pp. 47 - 54.

[16] As cited by Blalock, Greenwood and Abraham the eminent speakers presenting seminar papers included: Dr. D. W. Colvard, President, Mississippi State University; Dr. Fred H. Harrington, now President, University of Wisconsin; Harold Florea, Editorial Director, Watt Publishing Col; Larry Osman, Farm Writer, Milwaukee Journal; Charles B. Shuman, President, American Farm Bureau Federation; Milo Swanton, Executive Secretary, Wisconsin Council of Agricultural Cooperatives; C. A. Vines, Director of Extension, Arkansas; and E. L. Peterson, Executive Vice President, Milk Industry Foundation.

compared to views reported in recent perception studies involving specific Extension clientele groups, identified three points of concern that served as guides for the present study. The three points are:[17]

> (1) "Extension's various publics are not in complete agreement as toward what image the organization should be striving."

Perception studies showed a close relationship between the clientele's area of interest and what they felt Extension should represent. In addition, "Clientele involved in the perception studies indicated less need for departing appreciably from present general patterns than was implied by the seminar speakers."[18] Point 3 stated below reinforces this latter statement showing that clientele strongly favored what is commonly referred to as "traditional" Extension programs.

> (2) "Evidence indicates we have assumed that people know far more about the Extension Service than they actually do."

Four perception studies conducted in different states indicated a "great diversity and considerable misinformation among respondents concerning Extension's organizational affiliation."[19]

> (3) "There is lack of agreement as to what Extension's objectives and functions should be, the types of programs it should offer, and the clientele it should serve."

---

[17] Blalock, op. cit., p. 48.

[18] Blalock, op. cit., p. 48.

[19] Blalock, op. cit., p. 49.

All nine perception studies reviewed by the authors indicated that clientele groups showed a strong preference for Extension to continue its focus on youth development and dissemination of technology in agriculture and home economics. In the four studies conducted in Montana, Kansas, California and Wisconsin, clientele ranked Extension's function in the following order: first was "Providing information on specific farm and home problems"; second, "Teaching principles of farming"; tied for third and fourth were "Providing information and leadership for community services and activities" and "Consulting in the analysis and management of the total farm and home."[20]

The clientele's ranking of County Extension agents activities in studies conducted in Montana, Kansas, California, and Arizona showed complete agreement by ranking "providing information directly to farmers" as being first in importance.[21]

With regard to what clientele groups Extension should serve, the Montana, Kansas, Arizona and Wisconsin groups rated the family on the average-size farm the most important clientele. With few exceptions, the groups studied indicated a strong preference for Extension's time and effort to be devoted to people involved in farming. Non-farm people received low ranking with urban and city people being ranked at the bottom or close to the bottom of the list.

---

[20] Blalock, op. cit., p. 50.

[21] Blalock, op. cit., p. 51.

Generally the seminar speakers indicated that Extension should broaden its' role, however, there was considerable differences of opinion in what direction this "broadening" should be directed. As stated by Blalock, Greenwood and Abraham in discussing the controversial point of Extension's involvement in public affairs and policy proposed by the Scope Report, "Reaction to Extension's responsibility in this area was sharply divided among seminar speakers, ranging from a serious concern on the part of the Farm Bureau to complete endorsement by a member of the farm press."[22]

In review of the above information, two general findings were considered relevant to the objectives of the present study.

First, in the view of the inconsistancy of knowledge concerning Extension's organization affiliation there is a question of just how much knowledge Extension's clientele has of the Extension organization. Although the question of knowledge as used in the present study is directly concerned with the reorganization of the County Extension organization, - the results obtained should be of value in shedding some light on this particular question.

Secondly, there is the question of whether or not Extension should be involved with people other than farm people. Most of the people studied in the perception studies were agriculturally oriented and it is reasonable to assume that they would consider farm clientele and farm oriented programs to have greater priority in Extension than non-farm people or programs. Opinions on this question will be obtained from both farm and non-farm people in the present investigation.

---

[22]Blalock, op. cit., pp. 50-51.

Information concerning the relationship of a certain situational variable to Extension involvement (participation) was obtained from a study by Griffith.[23] In summarizing variables used in eight different studies he found that education was related to involvement in all studies, age was related in two studies and not related in four of the studies, while tenure showed no relationship in any of the studies. However, in Griffith's own study of 116 feed operators in Kansas, none of the five variables - size of business, age, educational level, degree of Extension involvement or tenure in business were found to be significantly associated with feed dealer's perception of Extension.[24]

Summary

In this review of literature, the concepts for the present study have been defined. They are knowledge, participation and attitude (opinion). An identification of each concept was made in respect to the type of measurement sought. Additional information from related research studies has been reported to establish a general frame of reference on which to base the study.

---

[23]Paul W. Griffith, "Formula Feed Operator's Perception of the Kansas Agricultural Extension Service" (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Wisconsin), pp. 47-48.

[24]op. cit. p. 47, 48.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Population

Two populations were used is this study, one was the lay leaders and the other, the lay members.

The population of lay leaders includes only those persons elected to serve on the Division Executive Committees and/or the Board of Directors of the Cooperative Extension Association of Jefferson County between the dates of January 1, 1966 and April 30, 1967. The total universe of 36 leaders identified according to the above criteria were included in the study.

The lay member population included all persons recorded on the mailing lists of the Agriculture, Home Economics and 4-H Divisions as of December 28, 1966. Excluded from the lay member population were:

(1) All lay leaders identified in the lay leader population described above.

(2) All members designated as complimentary members.

(3) All out-of-county persons listed.

(4) Any membership identified with a company, corporation or organizational name without a specifically named individual designated as the member, and

(5) All 4-H members under 18 years of age.

4-H members 18 years of age and older were included since they meet the minimum voting age requirement of the Extension Association.

The 4-H members meeting this age requirement and all currently enrolled 4-H leaders constituted the portion of the lay member population identified with the 4-H Division.

The author was concerned with obtaining information from only those individuals residing in Jefferson County and currently participating in the Jefferson County Extension programs. Of the total lay member population 187 members were excluded on the basis of the five factors, explained above, leaving a final lay member population of 2,331 persons. The large number of lay members made it necessary to draw a sample of this group for this study.

Sampling

Literature by Parten[1], Sabrosky[2] and Best[3] on sampling, indicated a five percent sample of the member population of 116 members was adequate. Since the member population consisted of three membership divisions - 4-H, Agriculture and Home Economics - a stratified sample was drawn as shown in the following Table.

---

[1]Mildred B. Parten, Surveys, Pools and Samples, (New York: Harper & Bros., 1950), Chapter IX, pp. 290 - 330.

[2]Darcie Byrn (ed.), Evaluation In Extension, (Topeka, Kansas: H. M. Ives & Sons, Inc., 4th Ed. 1965), pp. 204 - 206.

[3]John W. Best, Research in Education, (Englewood Cliffs, N. Y.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959), pp. 204 - 206.

TABLE I

COMPOSITION OF LAY MEMBER SAMPLE

Division	Total Population	No. in Sample (5%)	Percent of Sample
Agriculture	909	45	38.8
Home Economics	1188	59	50.9
4-H	234	12	10.3
Totals:	2331	116	100.0%

The member population characteristics of division membership and geographic location were variables judged by the author to be significant to the study and were thus used as a basis for stratifying the sample. The reasons for stratifying based on these two factors were:

(1) Division Membership - There are marked variations in the method of operation and content of the three Extension program divisions - 4-H, Home Economics and Agriculture. The program differences influence the amount and kind of contact a division member would have with the Extension organization which in turn would influence his knowledge and opinion of the Extension organization. For these reasons the author wanted assurance that the data would be obtained proportionately from the three division memberships.

(2) Geographic - Cooperative Extension programs have been predominantly agriculturally oriented during most of its existance however

in the past ten years more emphasis has been placed on programs for the suburban and urban populations. The reorganization of Cooperative Extension gave greater flexibility and opportunity for Extension to develop and become more involved in programs other than traditional agriculture programs. All of the Extension program divisions in Jefferson County have a substantial membership from the suburban and urban population areas along with the agricultural membership. The author wanted to be assured of obtaining data from all membership areas - non-agricultural and agricultural.

The prescribed number of members representing each division was selected randomly from mailing lists on which names were grouped according to their mailing address and numbered consecutively from 1 to 2331. A starting number was randomly selected using a Friden 130 Electric Calculator. Beginning with the selected starting number, every twentieth name was selected for the sample.

Interview Schedule Development

An interview schedule was selected to collect study data to insure a higher degree of reliability and validity. The techniques and methods used in developing and implementing the interview schedule were obtained from information offered by Gallup and Fessenden[4].

The interview schedule (Appendix D) consisted of three parts. Part I was designed to obtain "face data" and information on the

---

[4]Byrn, op. cit., p. 45 - 69.

respondent's participation in the Extension program to determine a participation score. Part II consisted of knowledge questions developed directly from the new constitution and by-laws of the Cooperative Extension Association of Jefferson County. Part III was designed to determine the respondents attitude as denoted by the opinions recorded by the respondent relative to statements of changes affected by the reorganization.

Method of Scoring Participation

The method of obtaining a participation score closely paralleled that used by Lawson[5] and Lacy[6]. The criteria and scores used to determine Extension participation are shown in Table II.

---

[5]Winfred M. Lawson, "Commercial Cotton Farm Operators 'Perception' of the California Agricultural Extension Service," (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1959), p. 44.

[6]Micajah P. Lacy, "The Effects of Involvement on the Participants in Cooperative Extension Program Planning in Waupaca County, Wisconsin," (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1961), pp. 43, 44.

TABLE II

METHOD OF SCORING PARTICIPATION

Criteria	Score
Extension Membership	1
Member of Executive Committee or Board of Directors	1
Member of Extension Committee other than Executive or Board of Directors	1
Visits by Extension Agent during the past 12 months	1
Personal visits to the Extension offices in the past 12 months	1
Attendance at any Extension sponsored meeting	1
Total	6

Extension membership was included in this score because 5 members of the new Board of Directors and Executive Committees had not been members of any Extension program prior to their election to the Board or Executive Committee.

Method of Scoring Knowledge

Knowledge measurement was based on the respondents answers to 18 knowledge questions. Four responses were offered with each question and the respondents were instructed to select one of the responses offered. One of the responses was correct, two were incorrect and the

fourth "do not know." The measurement of knowledge was made by using completed objective questions and statements. There were no open end questions. Scoring on the knowledge test had a possible range of zero to 18.

Method of Scoring Attitude

A Likert-Type attitude scale was used to measure attitude[7]. Possible answers to attitude statements were agree, tend to agree, neutral, tend to disagree and disagree. Attitude scores, shown in Table III, ranged from a 1 to 5 value for each statement.

TABLE III

METHOD OF SCORING ATTITUDE

Criteria	Score
Agree	1
Tend to Agree	2
Neutral	3
Tend to Disagree	4
Disagree	5

[7]Best, op. cit., pp. 157 - 160.

Ten attitude statements were used. A score of 10 on the attitude test indicated complete agreement on all statements and a score of 50 indicated total disagreement.

All statements in the attitude test were positively oriented toward the new Extension organization. Therefore, the attitude measurement as designed here measured only in terms of favorableness.

Collection of Data

Interviews were conducted by a team of nine Extension agents working on the Extension staff in Jefferson County. Determination of the agents interest in conducting the interviews for the study was made at a meeting with the agents in December 1966. An orientation and instruction meeting for the agent interviewers was held in March 1967. Prior to the March meeting a copy of the interview instructions, interviewing procedure and techniques[8] and the interview schedule[9] was sent to each agent for their review before the meeting. All interviews were conducted by the interviewers between April 1, 1967 and May 24, 1967.

All of the lay leader population was contacted and interview schedules completed. Six members of the lay member sample were out-of-town for an extended period of time or were unable to be reached for an interview. Alternates were selected for each member unable to

---

[8] Byrn, op. cit., pp. 53 - 55.

[9] See appendices.

be interviewed by taking the name on the mailing list immediately following the name of the member originally selected for the sample. The second choice in all six cases was contacted and the interview schedule completed. The total lay member sample of 116 persons were interviewed.

Pretest

After the interview schedule was reviewed and corrected by the researcher's advisory committee the schedule was pretested by the researcher and three of the agent interviewers on 10 persons selected at random from the two study groups. Four persons from the leader group and two persons from each division of the member sample were selected for the pretest. The researcher conducted one of the pretest interviews prior to the pretest interviews made by the agents in an effort to identify any problems or difficulties in administering the schedule.

Results of the pretest found the schedule to be satisfactory with only a few minor corrections needed. A major value in the pretest was in the assistance it offered in orientating and instructing the interviewers. All of the 10 pretest interviews were judged to be acceptable and were included in the groups under study.

Tabulation and Analysis of Data

All interview schedules were checked for completion by the researcher. Information collected on the schedules was coded and trans-

ferred to IBM punch cards. One IBM card was used per interview schedule. All key punching, verifying, tabulating, sorting and recording operations were accomplished at the Computer Center at Virginia Polytechnic Institute. Statistical procedures used included frequency distributions, rank-difference correlation and chi-square.

The rank-difference correlation coefficient[10], p, was used to test for correlation between the two study group scores on the knowledge and attitude tests.

$$p = 1 - \frac{6 \times \leq D^2}{N(N^2-1)}$$

p = coefficient of correlation from rank differences

D^2 = sum of the squares of differences in rank

N = number of pairs

The significance of p was tested using a table offered by Garrett.[11]

Chi-square values were obtained to identify significant difference in the data for the two study groups using the fourfold contingency table.[12]

$$X^2 = \frac{N(AD-BC)^2}{(A+B)(C+D)(A+C)(B+D)}$$

---

[10]Henry E. Garrett, Statistics in Psychology and Education, (New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1958), pp. 371 - 375.

[11]Ibid., p. 201.

[12]Ibid., p. 265.

Where entries in the fourfold table had a value of 5 or less and the X^2 value was significant the Yates' correction for continuity[13], X_c^2, was employed.

$$X_c^2 = \frac{N(|AD-BC|-N/2)^2}{(A+B)(C+D)(A+C)(B+D)}$$

The median test[14] was used to obtain a chi-square value when there was a value of zero in a cell of the fourfold table. Chi-square and correlation values at the .05 level and below were considered significant.

Tables were designed to identify the differences found within and between the groups studied.

Evaluation and Criticism of Methodology

One of the strong features in the methodology of this study as viewed by the researcher was the opportunity to collect the study data via the interview method. Considering the nature of the study, the author believes the interview method of obtaining the research data offered an optimum amount of reliability and validity compared to any other method of collecting the data[15]. Reports from the interviewers indicated there was very little explanation necessary in

---

[13] Ibid.

[14] Ibid., pp. 268 - 270.

[15] Best, op. cit., p. 167.

conducting the interview other than the amount of instruction outlined in the interview procedures. It is recognized that some bias may have entered into the data if the interviewer had to explain any of the statements found in Part II or III of the schedule however very few incidences of this nature were related.

The author recognizes the risk in making predictions from a 5% sample and acknowledges that a larger sample of lay members may have increased the validity of the data. However, the size of the sample chosen rests largely on the judgement of the researcher after all factors pertinent to the population are studied along with the amount of time and finances available for the research project.

CHAPTER IV

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS AND LEVEL OF EXTENSION PARTICIPATION OF THE LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS

The general characteristics associated with each of the two study groups will be described in this chapter. The first portion of the chapter will be devoted to a presentation of personal characteristics including age, education, sex, residence, occupation, income and tenure. The final portion will explain the levels of Extension participation. Information presented here will serve as a background for the data presented in the following chapter.

Personal Characteristics

Age

The mean age of the leaders was 44.9 years and of the members 46.9 years. A review of Table IV reveals that essentially the age distribution of the leaders closely parallels the age distribution of the members.

Education

The leader group attained a substantially higher educational level than the member group. Close to one-half, 44.4 percent, of the leaders had at least one or more years of college education with one-third of the group having attended 4 or more years of college. In

TABLE IV

LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS CLASSIFIED BY AGE

AGE GROUPS	Leaders		Members	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
18 - 29 years	0	0.0	8	6.9
30 - 39 years	12	33.3	28	24.1
40 - 49 years	12	33.3	30	25.9
50 - 59 years	10	27.8	27	23.3
60 - 69 years	2	5.6	14	12.1
70 - 79 years	0	0.0	6	5.2
80 - 89 years	0	0.0	3	2.5
Totals	36	100.0	116	100.0

TABLE V

LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS CLASSIFIED BY EDUCATIONAL LEVEL

HIGHEST GRADE COMPLETED	Leaders		Members	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1st - 8th Grade	1	2.9	15	12.9
9th - 11th	3	8.3	28	24.1
12th	16	44.4	45	38.9
1 - 3 Years of College	4	11.1	18	15.5
4 Years or more of College	12	33.3	10	8.6
Totals	36	100.0	116	100.0

contrast only 24.1 percent or 20 percent fewer members than leaders received any college education. Only 8.6 percent of the members had 4 or more years of college education. The mean education level for leaders was 13.4 years and for members 11.6 years. The median for each group was 12.5 years, which was above the median educational level of 10.1 years for males and 11.2 years for females established by the 1960 census for the population of Jefferson County.[1] Table V gives the frequency distribution of the education levels for both study groups.

Sex

An almost identical inverse ratio of men to women in terms of percentage existed between the member and leader groups. Table VI shows the proportion of men to women in both groups.

TABLE VI

LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS CLASSIFIED BY SEX

	Leader		Member	
SEX	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Female	15	41.7	68	58.6
Male	21	58.3	48	41.4
Totals	36	100.0	116	100.0

[1] The People of Jefferson County, Bulletin No. 62-22, Dept. of Rural Sociology, Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y. 1963, pp. 43 - 45.

The membership group consisted of 17.2 percent more women than men but in the leader group men outnumbered women by 16.6 percent.

Residence

Except for the categories of "City" and "Country - not farm" the leader and member groups closely match each other in regard to place of residence. The totals of village and suburb residences of both groups shown in Table VII indicates only a 2% difference. The total for the village/suburb residences for the leader group was 19.5 percent and for the members 21.5 percent.

Over one-half of the respondents in both groups claim farm residences. A difference of only 2.3 percent existed between the two study groups in this residence category.

Occupation

Well over half of the respondents interviewed in both groups were involved in farming or in some type of agricultural business. Over one-half of the leaders, 52.8 percent, and just under one-half of the members, 46.5 percent, listed farming as their occupation. The frequency distributions of occupations for both study groups in Table VIII shows a close similarity in occupational classifications.

Income

Farming was a source of income for over half of the respondents in each of the study groups. A slightly higher percentage of leaders than members received over 50 percent of their income from farming

TABLE VII

LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS CLASSIFIED BY PLACE OF RESIDENCE

PLACE OF RESIDENCE	Leader		Member	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Farm	20	55.5	67	57.8
Country - Non-Farm	2	5.6	15	12.9
Village - Pop. less than 2500	6	16.7	19	16.4
Village - Pop. 2500 to 20,000	1	2.8	1	.9
Suburbs - near village	0	0.0	3	2.5
Suburbs - near city	0	0.0	2	1.7
City	7	19.4	9	7.8
Totals	36	100.0	116	100.0

Table VIII

LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS CLASSIFIED BY OCCUPATION

OCCUPATION	Leader		Member	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Agriculture Production (Farming)	19	52.8	54	46.5
Agri-Business*	5	13.9	14	12.1
Non-Agriculture	12	33.3	48	41.4
Totals	36	100.0	116	100.0

*Includes Agricultural Suppliers, Processors & Retired Farmers.

(See Table IX). Respondents reporting income from only non-farm sources were almost identical in both groups: 41.7 percent of the leaders and 44.0 percent of the members.

Tenure

A high proportion of the respondents had 6 or more years membership in Extension. Fifty-five percent of the members and 65 percent of the leaders had in excess of 10 years membership. Tenure reported by leader respondents is similar to that reported by the members (Table X).

Summary of Personal Characteristics

Observing the frequency distributions presented in Tables IV thru Table X, the personal characteristics of age, residence, occupation, income and tenure of the leader and member groups were generally similar in composition. The characteristics of education and sex reflect some marked differences:

(1) A higher proportion of leaders than members had some college education.

(2) The percentage of women in the member group was 17.2 percent more than the men, however, in the leader group the percentage of women was 16.6 percent less than the percentage of men.

TABLE IX

LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS CLASSIFIED BY INCOME

INCOME	Leader		Member	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
50% + From Farm	18	50.0	49	42.2
Less Than 50% From Farm	3	8.3	16	13.8
Non-Farm	15	41.7	51	44.0
Totals	36	100.0	116	100.0

TABLE X

LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS CLASSIFIED BY TENURE OF MEMBERSHIP IN EXTENSION

LENGTH OF TENURE	Leader		Member	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Less than 1 year	5	13.9	5	4.3
1 - 2 years	0	0.0	8	6.9
3 - 5 years	1	2.8	22	19.0
6 - 10 years	6	16.7	17	14.6
11 - 20 years	10	27.8	35	30.2
Over 20 years	14	38.8	29	25.0
Totals	36	100.0	116	100.0

Extension Participation

Extension participation is an individual's personal involvement in any Extension activity or event. A participation score level was obtained using the following six criteria:

1. Current membership in an Extension program Division, (Home Economics, 4-H, or Agriculture).
2. Member of a Division Executive Committee prior to 1966.
3. Member of an Extension Committee other than the Board of Directors or Division Executive Committee.
4. Have been visited by a County Extension agent during the past twelve months. (Most visits by agents are made only if requested by the member).
5. Have visited the County Extension offices during the past twelve months.
6. Attendance at Extension activities or meetings during the past twelve months.

Each positive response to any of the above criteria was given a value of one. Responses indicating no participation were given a zero value. A score of six is the maximum score and zero the minimum.

The leader group recorded a substantially higher amount of participation than the member group. A total of 32 of the 36 leaders or 88.9 percent (see Table XI) were in the high level of participation whereas only 26.7 percent of the members made the high level. A difference of 62.2 percent separated the two groups at the two levels of participation.

TABLE XI

LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS CLASSIFIED
BY LEVEL OF EXTENSION PARTICIPATION

	Leader		Member	
PARTICIPATION SCALE	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Low (1-3)	4	11.1	85	73.3
High (4-6)	32	88.9	31	26.7
Totals	36	100.0	116	100.0

A chi-square value between the leader and member groups with regard to Extension participation was significant beyond the .001 level (see Table XII). Due to the nature of the lay leader role in the Extension organization it would be expected that lay leaders have a high level of participation in comparison to the lay members.

TABLE XII

COMPARISON OF LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS RELATIVE TO LEVELS OF EXTENSION PARTICIPATION

Study Group	N	Level of Participation: Low (1-3)	Level of Participation: High (4-6)	X^2	X_c^2	P
Leaders	36	4	32	43.748	41.224	.001
Members	116	85	31			
Totals	152	89	63			

The relationships found between the levels of participation and the two study groups' knowledge and opinion of the new Extension organization will be presented in Chapter V.

CHAPTER V

LEADERS' AND MEMBERS' KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDE OF THE EXTENSION REORGANIZATION

The major objectives of this study are to determine the extent of knowledge and the nature of the attitudes (opinions) held by the lay leaders and members concerning the new Extension organization of Jefferson County. This chapter will present and analyze the knowledge and opinion responses obtained from the leader and member groups. Identification will be made of the relationships found between the two dependent variables, knowledge and opinion, and the independent variables of age, education, sex, occupation, income, residence, tenure, and Extension participation.

Knowledge Response

Responses by leaders and members to the eighteen knowledge questions are presented in Table XIII, Table XIV and Table XV with the responses to each question separated into three categories--right, wrong, and do not know. The highest possible score in any of the three categories for leaders was 36 and for members 116.

Thirteen of the eighteen knowledge questions were answered correctly by more than half of the leaders, however, only two of the knowledge questions were answered correctly by one-half or more of the members. Ten of the questions were answered correctly by less than twenty five percent of the members.

Question 3, "Function of the Division Executive Committee," and question 17, "Official Name," received the highest number of correct

TABLE XIII

RESPONSES BY LEADERS AND MEMBERS TO KNOWLEDGE QUESTIONS #1 THROUGH #6

Question No.	Subject*	Leaders				Members			
		Right	Wrong	Do Not Know	RANK**	Right	Wrong	Do Not Know	RANK**
1	Membership Requirement--	16	18	2	17	33	65	18	8
2	Main Governing Body Is--	32	3	1	3	36	28	52	5
3	Function of the Division Executive Committee--	34	1	1	1	64	12	40	1
4	No. of Supervisors on Board of Directors--	24	8	4	11	13	14	89	16
5	The Administrative Committee Is--	27	5	4	7	23	33	60	10
6	No. of Extension Program Divisions That Can be Established--	17	16	3	15	20	19	77	12

*See Part II of the Interview Schedule for complete wording of the knowledge questions (Appendix D).
**Questions are ranked according to number of right responses. Ties are broken giving rank preference to the question having the least number of wrong responses.

TABLE XIV

RESPONSES BY LEADERS AND MEMBERS TO KNOWLEDGE QUESTIONS #7 THROUGH #12

Question No.	Subject*	Leaders				Members			
		Right	Wrong	Do Not Know	RANK**	Right	Wrong	Do Not Know	RANK**
7	Responsibility of Division Executive Committee--	29	6	1	6	44	29	43	3
8	Establishment of Inter-County Programs--	23	6	7	12	35	11	70	6
9	Five Members of the Board of Directors are Elected--	22	8	6	13	28	17	71	9
10	Election of President--	27	6	3	8	19	30	67	13
11	Chairman of Administrative Committee serves as--	16	7	13	16	12	20	84	17
12	Handling of Extension Finances--	25	7	4	10	18	18	80	14

*See Part II of the Interview Schedule for complete wording of the knowledge questions (Appendix D).
**Questions are ranked according to number of right responses. Ties are broken giving rank preference to the question having the least number of wrong responses.

TABLE XV

RESPONSES BY LEADERS AND MEMBERS TO KNOWLEDGE QUESTIONS #13 THROUGH #18

Question No.	Subject*	Leaders				Members			
		Right	Wrong	Do Not Know	RANK**	Right	Wrong	Do Not Know	RANK**
13	Establishment of Special Program Divisions--	25	6	5	9	22	13	81	11
14	No. of members of each executive committee on the Board of Directors--	31	1	4	4	14	11	91	15
15	No. of state staff on the Board of Directors--	15	12	9	18	7	12	97	18
16	Election of Division Executive Committee--	31	3	2	5	33	26	57	7
17	Official Name--	34	2	0	2	60	32	24	2
18	Minimum Voting Age--	17	4	15	14	37	15	64	4

*See Part II of the Interview Schedule for complete wording on the knowledge questions (See Appendix D).

**Questions are ranked according to number of right responses. Ties are broken giving rank preference to the question having the least number of wrong responses.

responses from both the members and leaders and were ranked first and second respectively in both groups.

Question 15, "Number of state staff on the Board of Directors," ranked eighteenth in both groups, having the least number of correct responses. Eleven of the twelve leaders giving the wrong responses to this question believed none of the state Extension staff were members on the Board.

Question 1, "membership requirement," had the highest number of wrong answers in both groups with one-half of the leaders and over one-half of the members giving the wrong response. The answer given by 17 of the 18 leaders and 59 of the 65 members giving the wrong response was "payment of a fee." A major change in the Extension reorganization was to make Extension membership open to anyone listed as a participant in an Extension program whether or not a fee was charged.

All sixteen wrong responses given by leaders to question 6, "The number of Extension program divisions that can be established," gave three divisions as their response. A principle point of discussion during the reorganization concerned allowing ample flexibility in the new organization for the addition or deletion of program divisions as necessitated by program needs. "One or more" divisions was the correct response to this question.

Question 11, "Chairman of the administrative committee serves as," and question 18, "minimum voting age," were answered correctly by less than fifty percent of the leaders. Both of these questions had the highest number of responses in the "do not know" category in the leader group.

Tables XIII, XIV and XV indicate that leaders tended to give a definite answer to most of the questions rather than use the "do not know" response. Members had a high proportion of their responses in the "do not know" category. The author believed the leaders felt compelled to know the answers because of their role as a leader and therefore refrained from using the "do not know" response.

The rank-difference correlation coefficient, p, computed from the ranks for the knowledge questions had a value of .53 indicating a marked or substantial correlation.[1] The p value of .53 was significant at the .05 level.[2]

A substantially higher percentage of leaders were recorded in the high knowledge level than members (see Table XVI).

TABLE XVI

LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS CLASSIFIED BY LEVEL OF KNOWLEDGE OF THE EXTENSION REORGANIZATION

Level of Knowledge	Leaders		Members	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Low (0-9)	6	16.7	111	95.7
High (10-18)	30	83.3	5	4.3
Totals	36	100.0	116	100.0

[1]Henry E. Garrett, Statistics in Psychology and Education (New York: David McKay Co., Inc., 1958), p. 176.

[2]Ibid., p. 201.

A numerical score was given to each respondent based on the number of correct answers given to the eighteen knowledge questions. Two levels of knowledge were established; a low level for scores of zero to nine and a high level for scores of ten to eighteen. The leaders had 83.3 percent of their group in the high knowledge level whereas only 4.3 percent of the member group was in the high level.

The leaders' knowledge of the Extension reorganization was significantly higher than the members. The chi-square value presented in Table XVII was significant beyond the .001 level.

TABLE XVII

RELATIONSHIP OF LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS
LEVELS OF KNOWLEDGE OF THE EXTENSION REORGANIZATION

		LEVEL OF KNOWLEDGE				
Group	N	Low (0-9)	High (10-18)	X^2	X_c^2	P
Leaders	36	6	30	96.796	92.389	.001
Members	116	111	5			
Totals	152	117	35			

Opinion Response

Responses by leaders and members to the ten opinion statements presented in Table XVIII and Table XIX were listed in the five response classifications used in the interview-schedule: fully agree, tend to agree, neutral, tend to disagree and fully disagree.

TABLE XVIII

RESPONSES BY LEADERS AND MEMBERS TO OPINION
STATEMENTS #1 THROUGH #5 ON THE EXTENSION REORGANIZATION

Statement No.	Subject of Statement*	Leaders					Members				
		Fully Agree	Tend to Agree	Neutral	Tend to Disagree	Fully Disagree	Fully Agree	Tend to Agree	Neutral	Tend to Disagree	Fully Disagree
1.	Programs should be offered to other audiences--	28	8	0	0	0	69	31	3	10	3
2.	Authority rests with Board of Directors on policies and programs--	6	8	4	13	5	24	24	39	25	4
3.	Reorganization was necessary to develop new programs--	27	8	0	1	0	67	25	19	5	0
4.	Reorganization will strengthen program development--	24	8	3	1	0	49	37	22	7	1
5.	Right to vote given if enrolled, regardless if paid a fee or not--	21	6	6	3	0	40	26	22	22	6

*For complete wording of opinion statements see Part III of Interview Schedule (Appendix D).

TABLE XIX

RESPONSES BY LEADERS AND MEMBERS TO OPINION
STATEMENTS #6 THROUGH #10 ON THE EXTENSION REORGANIZATION

Statement No.	Subject of Statement*	Leaders					Members				
		Fully Agree	Tend to Agree	Neutral	Tend to Disagree	Fully Disagree	Fully Agree	Tend to Agree	Neutral	Tend to Disagree	Fully Disagree
6.	Authority to hire and and evaluate agents to rest with Board of Directors--	23	9	0	3	1	66	28	16	6	0
7.	Division Executive Committees should develop programs--	33	2	0	1	0	63	39	10	4	0
8.	State staff member should be member of Board of Directors--	15	2	2	12	5	40	20	30	19	7
9.	Member of County Board of Supervisors should be member of Board of Directors--	29	3	1	2	1	48	26	17	12	13
10.	Minimum voting age for an Extension member should be 18 years--	29	5	0	2	0	74	27	7	4	4

*For complete wording of opinion statements see Part III of Interview Schedule (Appendix D).

Responses to two statements reflect a substantial amount of disagreement by both groups in comparison to the opinion responses for all of the statements. Statement 2 concerning the power of the Board of Directors has the highest amount of disagreement by both groups. One-half of the leader group disagreed with this statement. Statement 8 concerning whether or not a member of the state Extension staff should be a voting member of the board of directors had the second highest number of disagree responses for both groups.

Responses by the members indicated some disagreement with statement 5 concerning voting privileges and statement 9 concerning representation from the board of supervisors on the board of directors.

The rank order comparison of the opinion responses is presented in TABLE XX. As described in Chapter III each opinion response classification was given a value of one to five beginning with a value of one for fully agree and progressing in order to a value of five for fully disagree. The number of responses in each opinion classification for each statement was multiplied by the assigned value and then added together to obtain a total score value for each statement. Scores for each statement were then ranked according to the highest amount of agreement for each study group. Low scores indicated high agreement and high scores low agreement.

The rank-difference correlation coefficient, p, for the ranked opinion scores had a value of .81 indicating a high correlation. The p value of .81 was significant beyond the .01 level.

Opinion scores were divided in two levels. A high level for scores of 10 to 19 and a low level for scores of 20 to 30. Table XXI

TABLE XX

RANK ORDER COMPARISON OF LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS OPINION RESPONSES IN TERMS OF AGREEMENT

Statement No.	Subject of Statement*	Leaders		Members	
		Score	Rank	Score	Rank
1.	Programs should be offered to other audiences--	44	2	195	5
2.	Authority rests with Board of Directors on policies and programs--	111	10	309	10
3.	Reorganization was necessary to develop new programs--	47**	3	194**	3
4.	Reorganization will strengthen program development--	53	6	222	6
5.	Right to vote given if enrolled, regardless if paid a fee or not--	63	8	276	8
6.	Authority to hire and evaluate agents to rest with Board of Directors--	58	7	194**	4
7.	Division Executive Committees should develop programs--	41	1	187	2
8.	State staff member should be member of Board of Directors--	98	9	281	9
9.	Member of County Board of Supervisors should be member of Board of Directors--	51	5	264	7
10.	Minimum voting age for an Extension member should be 18 years--	47**	4	185	1

*For complete wording of opinion statements see Part III of Interview Schedule (Appendix D).

**Tie scores were broken by giving order preference to statement having the smallest score in the "Tend to disagree" and "Fully Disagree" categories (See Table XVII and XVIII).

***Low scores indicate high agreement and high scores indicate low agreement.

presents the frequency distribution and percentage for the opinion scores recorded by the leader and member groups.

TABLE XXI

LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS CLASSIFIED BY LEVEL OF OPINION OF THE EXTENSION REORGANIZATION

Level of Opinion	Leaders		Members	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Low (20-30)	11	30.6	61	52.6
High (10-19)	25	69.4	55	47.4
Totals	36	100.0	116	100.0

The leader group had a substantially higher proportion in the high opinion level than the member group. The member group was divided almost equally between the two opinion levels. The leader group had over twice as many respondents in the high level than the low level.

The leaders' opinion of the Extension reorganization was significantly higher than the members. The chi-square value presented in Table XXII was significant beyond the .02 level.

TABLE XXII

RELATIONSHIP OF LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS LEVELS OF OPINION OF THE EXTENSION REORGANIZATION

Group	N	Level of Opinion		X^2	X_c^2	P
		Low (20-30)	High (10-19)			
Leaders	36	11	25	5.946	---	.02
Members	116	61	55			
Totals	152	72	80			

Relationship of Variables Identified in the Study

Relationship of the Leaders' and Members' Knowledge of the Extension Reorganization Compared to Their Opinion of the Extension Reorganization

The levels of knowledge of the leader and member groups were compared with the levels of opinion held by the leader and member groups concerning the Extension reorganization presented in Table XXIII.

TABLE XXIII

RELATIONSHIP OF LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS LEVELS OF KNOWLEDGE TO LEVELS OF OPINION OF THE EXTENSION REORGANIZATION

Level of Knowledge	N	Level of Opinion: Low (20-30)	Level of Opinion: High (10-19)	X^2	X_c^2	P
Leaders	36					
Low (0-9)	6	1	5	.900	---	---
High (10-18)	30	11	19			
Members	116					
Low (0-9)	111	58	53	1.339	---	---
High (10-18)	5	3	2			

No significant relationships were found for either group. Chi-square values were not significant at the .05 level.

Relationship of Leaders' and Members' Knowledge and Opinion to the Independent Variable of Extension Participation

The levels of knowledge of the Extension reorganization for the leader and member groups were compared to their levels of Extension participation. No significant relationships were found in either group presented in Table XXIV. Chi-square values were not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE XXIV

RELATIONSHIP OF EXTENSION PARTICIPATION BY LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS TO THEIR KNOWLEDGE OF THE EXTENSION REORGANIZATION

Level of Participation	N	Level of Knowledge		X^2	X_c^2	P
		Low (0-9)	High (10-18)			
Leaders	36					
Low (1-3)	4	0	4	---	.171*	---
High (4-6)	32	6	26			
Members	116					
Low (1-3)	85	82	3	.470	---	---
High (4-6)	31	29	2			

*Used median test to obtain chi square value due to absence of respondents in one cell of 2x2 table. See Chapter III of text.

The levels of opinion for the leader and member groups of the Extension reorganization were compared with the leaders and members levels of Extension participation presented in Table XXV. No significant relationships were found in either group. Chi-square values were not significant at the .05 level.

TABLE XXV

RELATIONSHIP OF EXTENSION PARTICIPATION OF LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS TO THEIR ATTITUDE TOWARD THE EXTENSION REORGANIZATION

Level of Participation	N	Attitude Level: Low (20-30)	Attitude Level: High (10-19)	X^2	X_c^2	P
Leaders	36					
Low (1-3)	4	2	2	.801	---	---
High (4-6)	32	9	23			
Members	116					
Low (1-3)	85	47	38	.935	---	---
High (4-6)	31	14	17			

Relationship of the Leaders' and Members' Levels of Knowledge to Selected Independent Variables

The level of knowledge for the leader and member groups of the Extension reorganization were compared to the independent variables of age, education, sex, occupation, income, residence and tenure identified in Chapter III. None of the independent variables were found to be significantly related to the levels of knowledge. Chi-square values presented in Table XXVI and Table XXVII were not significant at the .05 level.

Relationship of the Leaders' and Members' Levels of Opinion to Selected Independent Variables

The levels of opinion of the Extension reorganization for the leader and member groups were compared to the independent variables of age,

TABLE XXVI

RELATIONSHIP OF THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES OF AGE, EDUCATION, SEX AND OCCUPATION TO THE LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS KNOWLEDGE OF THE EXTENSION REORGANIZATION

Independent Variable	N	Level of Knowledge: Low (0-9)	Level of Knowledge: High (10-18)	X^2	X_c^2	P
AGE						
Leaders	36					
18 - 39 Yrs.	12	1	11	.900	---	---
40+ Yrs.	24	5	19			
Members	116					
18 - 39 Yrs.	36	35	1	.297	---	---
40+ Yrs.	80	76	4			
EDUCATION						
Leaders	36					
6 - 12 Grades	20	3	17	.090	---	---
1 - 5+ Yrs. College	16	3	13			
Members	116					
6 - 12 Grades	88	85	3	.598	---	---
1 - 5+ Yrs. College	28	26	2			
SEX						
Leaders	36					
Male	21	5	16	1.851	---	---
Female	15	1	14			
Members	116					
Male	48	47	1	.985	---	---
Female	68	64	4			
OCCUPATION						
Leaders	36					
Farm and Farm Related	24	3	21	.900	---	---
Non-Farm	12	3	9			
Members	116					
Farm and Farm Related	68	65	3	.004	---	---
Non-Farm	48	46	2			

TABLE XXVII

RELATIONSHIPS OF THE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES OF INCOME, RESIDENCE AND TENURE TO THE LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS KNOWLEDGE OF THE EXTENSION REORGANIZATION

Independent Variable	N	Level of Knowledge: Low (0-9)	Level of Knowledge: High (10-18)	X^2	X_c^2	P
INCOME						
Leaders	36					
Farm	21	3	18	.206	---	---
Non-Farm	15	3	12			
Members	116					
Farm	65	62	3	.033	---	---
Non-Farm	51	49	2			
RESIDENCE						
Leaders	36					
Farm	20	3	17	.090	---	---
Non-Farm	16	3	13			
Members	116					
Farm	67	64	3	.011	---	---
Non-Farm	49	47	2			
TENURE						
Leaders	36					
10 Yrs. or Less	12	3	9	.900	---	---
Over 10 Yrs.	24	3	21			
Members	116					
10 Yrs. or Less	52	51	1	.132	---	---
Over 10 Yrs.	64	60	4			

education, sex, occupation, income, residence and tenure.

The independent variable of sex was significantly related to the levels of opinion in the member group at the .02 level (see Table XXVIII). Women members held a significantly higher opinion of the Extension reorganization than men members.

There was no significant relationship between the independent variable of sex and the levels of attitude in the leader group.

The independent variables of age, education, occupation, income, residence and tenure presented in Table XXVIII and Table XXIX were not significantly related to levels of opinion in either the member or leader group. Chi-square values were not significant at the .05 level for these variables.

TABLE XXVIII

RELATIONSHIP OF THE VARIABLES OF AGE, EDUCATION, SEX AND OCCUPATION TO THE LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS OPINION OF THE EXTENSION REORGANIZATION

Independent Variable	N	Level of Opinion Low (20-30)	Level of Opinion High (10-19)	X^2	X_c^2	P
AGE						
Leaders	36					
18 - 39 Yrs.	12	6	6	1.945	---	---
40+ Yrs.	24	5	19			
Members	116					
18 - 39 Yrs.	36	22	14	1.522	---	---
40+ Yrs.	80	39	41			
EDUCATION						
Leaders	36					
6 - 12 Grades	20	6	14	.007	---	---
1 - 5+ Yrs. College	16	5	11			
Members	116					
6 - 12 Grades	88	47	41	.099	---	---
1 - 5+ Yrs. College	28	14	14			
SEX						
Leaders	36					
Male	21	6	15	.094	---	---
Female	15	5	10			
Members	116					
Male	48	32	16	6.511	---	.02
Female	68	29	39			
OCCUPATION						
Leaders	36					
Farm and Farm Related	24	7	17	.065	---	---
Non-Farm	12	4	8			
Members	116					
Farm and Farm Related	68	39	29	1.498	---	---
Non-Farm	48	22	26			

TABLE XXIX

RELATIONSHIP OF THE VARIABLES OF INCOME, RESIDENCE AND TENURE TO THE LEADER AND MEMBER GROUPS OPINION OF THE EXTENSION REORGANIZATION

Independent Variable	N	Level of Opinion Low (20-30)	Level of Opinion High (10-19)	X^2	X_c^2	P
INCOME						
Leaders	36					
Farm	21	6	15	.094	---	---
Non-Farm	15	5	10			
Members	116					
Farm	65	36	29	.464	---	---
Non-Farm	51	25	26			
RESIDENCE						
Leaders	36					
Farm	20	5	15	.655	---	---
Non-Farm	16	6	10			
Members	116					
Farm	67	37	30	.443	---	---
Non-Farm	49	24	25			
TENURE						
Leaders	36					
10 Yrs. or Less	12	5	7	1.047	---	---
Over 10 Yrs.	24	6	18			
Members	116					
10 Yrs. or Less	52	23	29	.383	---	---
Over 10 Yrs.	64	32	32			

CHAPTER VI

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The first section of this chapter presents a summary of the findings set forth in Chapter IV and Chapter V. The remainder of the chapter is devoted to sections on: Recommendations and Implications, and Suggestions for Further Research.

Summary of Findings

Personal Characteristics

Except for the characteristics of education and sex the personal characteristics of the leader and member groups were similar.

The average age of the leaders was 44.9 years and the members 46.9 years.

Over one-half of both groups lived on a farm with 55.5 percent of the leaders and 57.8 percent of the members claiming farm residences.

Farming was claimed as the main occupation by 52.8 percent of the leaders and 46.5 percent of the members. Non-agricultural occupations were reported by 33.3 percent of the leaders and 41.4 percent of the members.

Over fifty percent of both groups reported farming as a source of income with a slightly higher percentage of leaders than members

receiving more than half of their income from the farm. The percentage of leaders and members reporting non-farm income was about equal, 41.7 percent for leaders and 44.0 percent for members.

Fifty-five percent of the members and 65 percent of the leaders reported more than 10 years of tenure in the Extension organization.

Almost one-half of the leaders, 44.4 percent, had some college education whereas only 24.1 percent of the members had some college education. The mean educational level for the leaders was 13.4 years and for the members 11.6 years.

The percentage of women was 17.2 percent higher than the percentage of men in the member group and 16.6 percent less than the men in the leader group.

Extension Participation

Leaders recorded a significantly higher level of participation in Extension than the members. The chi-square test was significant beyond the .001 level. The percentage of leaders in the high level of Extension participation was 88.9 percent compared to the members 26.7 percent.

Knowledge of the Extension Reorganization

Leaders held a significantly higher level of knowledge of the Extension reorganization than the members. The percentage of leaders in the high level of knowledge was 83.3 percent compared to 4.3 percent for members. The chi-square test was significant beyond the .001 level.

The rank-difference correlation coefficient, p, had a value of .53 indicating a marked correlation between the leader and member groups comparing the rank order of knowledge questions having the most correct answers for both groups. The p value of .53 was significant at the .05 level.

Opinion of the Extension Reorganization

The leader group held a significantly higher opinion of the Extension reorganization than the member group. Members were about equally divided between the low and high levels of opinion whereas leaders had over twice as many respondents in the high level than the low level of opinion. The chi-square test was significant beyond the .02 level.

The rank-difference correlation coefficient, p, had a value of .81 indicating a high correlation between the opinions of the leader and member groups. The p value was significant beyond the .01 level.

Relationship Between Knowledge and Opinion of the Extension Reorganization

No significant relationships were found by comparing the levels of knowledge with the levels of opinion for either the leader or member groups. The chi-square tests were not significant at the .05 level.

Relationship of Knowledge and
Opinion of the Extension Reorganization
with Extension Participation

No significant relationships were found by comparing the levels of knowledge or levels of opinion with the levels of Extension participation for either the leader or member groups. Chi-square tests were not significant at the .05 level.

Relationship of Knowledge of the Extension
Reorganization with Selected Independent Variables

None of the independent variables of age, education, sex, occupation, income, residence or tenure were significantly related to the levels of knowledge for either the leader or member groups. Chi-square tests were not significant at the .05 level.

Relationship of Opinion of the Extension
Reorganization to Selected Independent Variables

The independent variable of sex was significantly related to the levels of opinion in the member group at the .02 level. Women members held a significantly higher opinion of the Extension reorganization than men members.

Sex was not significantly related to levels of opinion in the leader group.

The independent variables of age, education, occupation, income, residence and tenure were not significantly related to the levels of opinion in either the member or leader groups. Chi-square tests were not significant at the .05 level.

Recommendations and Implications

No specific recommendations can be made with regard to the relationship between variables due to the lack of statistical significance obtained in the study. However, data presented for each variable pointed to some implications regarding the leader and member groups and the Extension organization.

1. The close similarity in personal characteristics and the high correlation of knowledge and attitude test responses implies that the leaders were representative of the members.
2. Differences in knowledge levels imply that leaders may have a higher interest than members concerning how the new organization operates whereas members may have a high interest in what the organization has to offer in kinds of programs and assistance.
3. The low knowledge and low opinion levels obtained regarding the Extension Board of Directors having a member from the State Extension office and a member from the Board of Supervisors implies:
   A. There is a lack of knowledge concerning the County Extension Association's affiliation with the New York State Extension office and the Jefferson County Board of Supervisors, and/or -

B. There is a negative attitude toward the State Extension office and the Board of Supervisors which may be a reflection of a general feeling of anti-government control.

4. Generally, findings in the study indicate a need for more clarification concerning the new Extension organization.

Suggestions for Further Research

Findings in this study suggest that future research be considered in the following areas:

1. Repetition of the study in other Extension reorganized counties of New York State to further validate the findings of this study.
2. A study of the knowledge and attitudes of the Extension reorganization held by the state and county professional Extension staff and the lay leaders.
3. A study directed more to obtaining data on the understanding of the Extension reorganization.
4. A repeat of the study after five or six years to determine if there is any change in knowledge or attitude.
5. Studies to determine what variables are significantly related to levels of knowledge and attitude of the Extension reorganization.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

Best, John W. Research in Education. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1959.

Byrn, Darcie (ed.). Evaluation In Extension. Topeka, Kansas: H. M. Ives & Sons, Inc., 1965.

Dewey, John and Bentley, Arthur F. Knowing and the Known. Boston: The Beacon Press, 1949.

Good, Carter V. Dictionary of Education. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1959.

Hoslett, S. D. (ed.). Human Factors in Management. Parkville, Missouri: Park College Press, 1946.

Krech, D. and Crutchfield, R. S. Theory and Problems of Social Psychology. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1948.

Litterer, Joseph A. The Analysis of Organizations. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1965.

Parten, Mildred B. Surveys, Pools and Samples. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950.

Remmers, H. H. Introduction to Opinion and Attitude Measurement. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954.

Russell, Bertrand R. Human Knowledge, Its Scope and Limits. New York: Simon and Schuster, Inc., 1948.

Sanders, H. C. (ed.). The Cooperative Extension Service. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1966.

Spicer, Edward H. (ed.). Human Problems in Technological Change. New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1952.

Webster's New International Dictionary. 2nd ed. Springfield, Massachusetts: G. and C. Merriman Co., 1934.

Periodicals

Alpert, Burt and Smith, Patricia A. "How Participation Works," Journal of Social Issues, Vol. V, No. 1 (Winter 1949).

Blalock, T. C., Greenwood, Mary Nell, and Abraham, Roland H. "What the Public Thinks of Extension," Journal of Cooperative Extension, Vol. 1, No. 1 (Spring 1963).

DeFleur, Melvin L. and Westie, Frank R. "Attitude as a Scientific Concept," Social Forces, Vol 24, No. 1 (October 1963).

Evan, William M. "Dimensions of Participation in Voluntary Associations," Social Forces, Vol. 36, No. 2 (December 1957).

Warner, W. Keith. "Problems in Participation," Journal of Cooperative Extension, Vol. III, No. 4 (Winter 1965).

Bulletins

The People of Jefferson County. Bulletin No. 62-22. Ithaca: Cornell University, Dept. of Rural Sociology, 1963.

Reports

Federal Extension Service. The Cooperative Extension Service. . . Today. A Report Prepared by Subcommittee on Scope and Responsibility. Washington, D. C.: Federal Extension Service, 1958.

New York State Cooperative Extension Service. Report of the Study Committee on an Organizational Plan for Cooperative Extension in New York State. Ithaca, N. Y.: New York State Cooperative Extension Service, 1964.

Simons, L. R. The Extension Service Partnership with County Supporting Agencies in New York 1911-1961. Ithaca, N. Y.: New York State Cooperative Extension Service, 1962.

Unpublished Material

Beavers, Irene. "Iowa County Extension Committee Member's and Agent's Perception of Program Planning." Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1962.

Griffith, Paul W. "Formula Feed Operator's Perception of the Kansas Agricultural Extension Service." Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1961.

Lacy, Micajah P. "The Effects of Involvement on the Participants in Cooperative Extension Program Planning in Waupaca County, Wisconsin." Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1961.

Lawson, Winfred M. "Commercial Cotton Farm Operators 'Perception' of the California Agricultural Extension Service." Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Wisconsin, 1959.

Moore, Paul J. "Montana County Extension Program Planning Committee Members' Perception of the Cooperative Extension Service." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1962.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Instructions For Interviewers

TO ALL INTERVIEWERS:

Your contribution to this research study as an interviewer holds tremendous value and importance, not only in the actual completion of the study, but also in the significance and reliability of the results of the study. The following instructions and information will assist you in collecting accurate information during each interview. Please review all materials carefully. If you have any questions, please write them down and be prepared to ask them at the time of the telephone conference.

INSTRUCTIONS:

1. Read the enclosed statements on:

   A. Interviewing procedures and techniques.

   B. The purpose of the study.

2. Review the Interview-Schedule.

3. Participate in the telephone conference for the purpose of reviewing all of the interview materials and answering any questions. (A time will be arranged for this conference shortly after all interviewers have had an opportunity to read the materials.)

4. After the telephone conference each interviewer will receive a list of respondents to contact.

5. Procedure for interviewing:

   A. Call respondent and make an appointment in advance.

   B. When conducting interview follow procedures as outlined in instructions 1.-A. Be familiar with techniques outlined and used as needed.

C. Complete each part of the interview schedule in order as numbered. As each part is completed, place it in the manila envelope provided before proceeding to the next part.

D. Part II is to be completed by the respondent. You will fill out Part I and Part III as you ask the questions of the respondent.

6. Refusals - if any respondent refuses to participate in completing the schedule give the name of the respondent to Geraldine Cummings for forwarding to me. Replacement names will be provided. Do not interview any person that is not named on your respondent list.

7. Make sure all parts of the schedule are completed in full.

8. Seal each envelope after completing the interview, making sure the code number on each part of the schedule corresponds with the envelope code number.

9. Give all sealed envelopes to Geraldine Cummings.

My sincere thanks to each of you for helping with this research study. Good luck with your interviews.

Sincerely,

Robert A. Boice

APPENDIX B

Statement of Purpose For Interviewers

Statement of Purpose For Interviewers

At the annual meeting held December 12, 1965, the Jefferson County Extension organization voted to adopt a reorganization plan. This plan was developed by a special steering committee and approved by the County Extension Board of Directors for presentation to the Extension membership at the annual meeting for their action. On January 1, 1966, the new organization plan was put into effect according to the new constitution and by-laws adopted.

The Extension Association has been operating under the new plan for over a year. Although a few parts of the new system have not been fully tested, the lay Extension members and leaders have had an opportunity to become familiar with the new organization. Newspaper articles, radio programs and meetings were used during the later part of 1965 and early 1966 to explain the new organization plan to Extension members and the general public.

The success of the County Extension programs is largely dependent on the interest and understanding held by the lay Extension members and leaders of County Extension organization's purpose, operations and functions. The purpose of this study is to determine:

(1) Lay Extension members' and leaders' understanding of the new organization.

(2) Opinions held by the lay Extension members and leaders concerning the new organization.

In determining the answers to the above two primary questions, it is hoped that the resulting information may be used as a guide

to strengthen Extension's overall operation and programs in Jefferson County and assist in the reorganization of other County Extension organizations in New York State.

APPENDIX C

Interviewing Procedures and Techniques Used in Interviewer Orientation

INTERVIEWING PROCEDURES AND TECHNIQUES*

There are four main stages to making and completing an interview.

1. Gaining entrance, making the approach and establishing rapport.
2. Securing and recording information.
3. Closing the interview.
4. Editing.

Establishing Rapport

A good interview depends to a great extent on a quickly established feeling of trust and confidence in the interviewer by the respondent. Sincere friendliness on the part of the interviewer is a firm step in the direction of achieving this objective. Techniques for gaining admittance to a respondent's home and for establishing friendly relations (rapport) vary with the situation. A good interviewer will learn how to make on-the-spot adaptations to fit most situations likely to confront him.

Some techniques may be acquired from study of literature on the subject, but practice is also important. An interviewer needs to try to understand the reasons for resistance and to think of ways to overcome them. The most common reasons for resistence are shyness, fear of being sold something, feeling of inability to answer questions, and reluctance to talk about personal matters.

---

*Darcie Byrn (ed.), Evaluation in Extension (Topeka, Kansas: H. M. Ives & Sons, Inc., 1959), pp. 53 - 55.

Neat personal appearance and appropriate dress are important in creating good first impressions. Equally important is the general tone of your introductory remarks. They should (1) identify you as the interviewer, (2) explain briefly the reason for your call, and (3) ask for the respondent's cooperation.

One interviewer has used successfully the following as an opening sentence: "Good morning (good afternoon, hello). I am (name)." Pause. "May I come in and visit with you for a few minutes?" This provides an opportunity for the respondent to give his or her name, if it is not already known to the interviewer.

Most people invite the interviewer in on this remark. However, if there is a hesitancy or if some question is asked as to the reason why, the next step is to explain in a little more detail what you are doing and why. It may help to include some statement to let the respondent know that cooperation is important. "You are one of a few people selected and your opinion (cooperation) is important."

"How was I (my name) selected?" is a question often asked by a person being interviewed. The answer to this should be honest and brief. Something like, "Well, we cannot visit everyone, so we are talking to every fifth person on your block (in this neighborhood, on our list, and so on)," usually will satisfy the respondent. Sometimes assurance is needed that names will not be used in the report, or that the interviewer is not selling a product.

An alert interviewer usually can pick up something of common interest to talk about if a person shows signs of wanting to cut off the conversation. If a homemaker says she is busy, you can recognize the fact, express understanding, and make an appointment for a return call at a more convenient time.

Refusals should not be accepted except as a last resort. If an interviewer has a high number of refusals, he may need some help with his techniques. On the other hand, it might be in the best interests of the study to relieve him of his interviewing assignments. Sometimes, the person whose sensitive nature makes him a poor interviewer can make a valuable contribution to the study as a discriminating checker or, later, as a clerical aid in tabulating the data.

Almost anyone can be interviewed if you use the right approach. Do not force the interview on a person, and never become impatient or angry. If he refuses, try to make an appointment for some other time. If this also fails, thank him for considering your request and leave, showing no resentment. This leaves the way clear for another interviewer - the crew leader, an older (or younger) interviewer, or one of the opposite sex - to make a try at getting the interview.

Quite often, the respondent will give an interview when another interviewer approaches him - possibly because he now realizes the importance of the study or, maybe, because he regretted his original refusal but didn't want to back down.

Refusals happen very seldom so do not anticipate them. Try to avoid them but, if you can't, accept them graciously. Then forget it. Remember, there will be some refusals in any survey, so don't take it personally if you get one.

Before giving up on assignments, make at least two call-backs where the respondent was not at home on your first call, or was too busy to be interviewed. Be sure to keep a record of incomplete interviews, explaining what you did, and why you had to give up on them.

Securing Information

Thorough familiarity with questions helps to make a smooth interview. Under no circumstances may interviewers change the wording of questions. However, you can re-read them and define or explain a word if you feel the respondent does not understand it.

Explain that you are going to write down replies, and why. If you read back answers to free response questions you assure respondents that they are not being misquoted. This sometimes helps to secure more complete replies as respondents may add to their original remarks if they desire.

Do not be afraid to wait for a reply. Time may be needed to form thoughts and to think of ways to express them. A smile, or "That's all right. Take your time in answering," sometimes helps. Be a good listener. Let the respondent talk. Do not rush him but try to discourage talk about incidentals if they have no relation to the study.

Be careful to follow questions in the order of their appearance on the schedule and never omit any that apply to the person being interviewed. However, be alert to notice when a person answers a question during conversation that is to be asked later.

Replies must be encouraged without appearing to agree or disagree. Agreement may influence a person to give future answers in terms of what he or she thinks you want. Disagreement may cause a person to suppress real opinions. Watch for reactions from the respondents; make marginal notes about them.

If interest appears to lag, some statement as to the time required to complete the interview may help. A change in tone of voice, or a shift in pace may help. Transition statements from one area of a schedule to another also help to maintain interest. For example, if you have been asking questions about clothing, you might say "You have answered the questions on clothing. Now I have a few others about foods." Or, "The information you have given us about crops raised last year will be very helpful. Our next questions are about livestock."

In opinion or attitude questions, it is very important to assure respondents that there are no right or wrong answers. Frequently a person will ask an interviewer, "Is that what you wanted me to say?" In this case, you can say, "Yes, if that is your opinion. There is no one answer to this question."

More skill and patience are required to obtain replies to free response (open-end) questions than to check off questions. A friendly tone of voice and a conversational manner will encourage a reply. "I don't know," or "I have no opinion," are easy ways to avoid expressing real feelings. An interviewer must find ways of getting past such replies to get usable answers. Sometimes repeating the question in a different tone of voice helps.

Sometimes careful probing is justified. If probing is used, you must be careful not to use suggestive probes. For example, you might ask the question, "Why do you like a 15-minute radio program on one subject?" A suggestive probe would be, "More interesting?" This suggests a reply, and may be pounced upon by the respondent regardless of what his real reason might have been.

Once the person has started to talk, the interviewer may probe for more complete answers by comments such as, "Anything else?" "Other ideas." "Another comment?" or "Are you sure that is all?" These do not suggest answers but do encourage the respondent to come up with a more complete answer.

It should be noted here that there are occasions when "no opinion" and "don't know" replies are valid answers. If a person really has no opinion or does not know, he should not be forced into replying further. More harm than good may be done by trying to force an answer if the respondent is reluctant to reply to questions. Rather than antagonize the respondent, the interviewer simply writes "refusal" or "did not choose to answer" beside the question.

A final reminder while securing information: Write clearly and make all entries as complete as possible. Although they may seem perfectly obvious when recorded, sketchy notes, unfinished phrases, or single words often prove to be meaningless or ambiguous to the person who must tabulate the answers. While reading back the reply to the respondent as a check on accuracy and completeness, try to imagine what a person, who must react to the recorded entry only, will get out of it.

Closing the Interview

A pleasant impression of both study and study personnel should be left with the respondent. He or she should be left with a feeling of having been helpful and that the cooperation has been appreciated. Always extend some expression of appreciation at the close of the interview.

Try to have the parting be such that your return, either as an individual or as a member of this or another research team, would be welcomed. You never know when you may have to call back about some item, or follow through on some afterthought related to the study. It is a matter of good common sense and professional ethics to try to preserve friendly relations for future studies, whether by you or by others, which may involve your respondent.

Editing

Too much emphasis cannot be given to the importance of checking the completeness, accuracy, legibility and consistency of each

schedule before you turn it in. Careless editing by the interviewer can bias the results of the entire study. Never fail to go over the schedule, either before you leave the respondent or before you move on for the next interview. In this way you can clear up discrepancies and correct them.

Be sure all identifying information is entered. Write out abbreviations, complete fragmentary sentences, rewrite hard to read passages, and expand sketchy remarks. Make marginal comments to explain apparently inconsistent or unusual entries. Sign the form so that others will know who to contact for further clarification or follow-up tasks.

Although your work will be edited again, both by you and by others, the editing you do at this point is likely to be the most effective in improving the overall quality of the study.

APPENDIX D

Interview - Schedule

_____ Interviewer

_____
Number

INTERVIEW - SCHEDULE

PART I

EXTENSION REORGANIZATION

OF JEFFERSON COUNTY, N. Y.

This part is to be completed by the interviewer. Please complete all questions. When it is necessary to ask questions of the respondent please ask question in the form stated as much as possible.

1. (For computer use.)

2. (For computer use.)

3. Sex of Respondent? (check one)

_____ Male

_____ Female

4. The respondent's place of residence is:
(Check the one answer that best describes where the respondent lives.)

_____ On a farm.

_____ In the country, but not on a farm.

_____ In a village having a population of less than 2,500.

_____ In a village having a population of 2,500 - 20,000. (Carthage)

_____ In a built-up or suburban area near the village of _____.

_____ In a built-up or suburban area near the city of Watertown.

_____ In a city having a population of over 20,000.

FOR CODE USE ONLY
1.
2.
3.
4.

5. The number of grades that you had an opportunity to complete in school is: (circle the highest grade completed)

0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 & over

6. State briefly the nature of the respondent's occupation. (For married women, please include statement of husband's occupation in addition to own.)

_____

_____

_____

_____

7. Your source of income (immediate family) would be classified as follows: (check one)

_____ Farm - (50% of net income* or more)

_____ Farm - (less than 50% of net income*)

_____ Non-farm

*Net income includes wages and salaries.

5, 6.

7.

8.

8. How many years have you been an Extension member according to the following categories:

(A) Agricultural Member

_____ Less than 1 yr.
_____ 1 - 2
_____ 3 - 5
_____ 6 - 10
_____ 11 - 20
_____ Over 20

(C) 4-H Leader

_____ Less than 1 yr.
_____ 1 - 2
_____ 3 - 5
_____ 6 - 10
_____ 11 - 20
_____ Over 20

(B) Home Economics Member

_____ Less than 1 yr.
_____ 1 - 2
_____ 3 - 5
_____ 6 - 10
_____ 11 - 20
_____ Over 20

(D) 4-H Member

_____ Less than 1 yr.
_____ 1 - 2
_____ 3 - 5
_____ 6 - 10
_____ 11 - 20
_____ Over 20

9. Were you a member of an Extension Division Executive Committee prior to 1966? (check one)

_____ yes
_____ no

If yes, check number of years according to following classifications.

_____ 1 year
_____ 2 years
_____ 3 years
_____ 4 years
_____ 5 years
_____ 6 years
_____ 7 years
_____ More than 7 yrs.

9.
10.
11.
12.
13.
14.

10. Have you ever served as a committee member or officer for any Extension activity, function or program other than stated in Question #9 (above)? (Examples: agricultural commodity committees, resource development committee, Home Economic's Unit officer, membership committeeman, Extension annual meeting or outing, nominating committee for annual Board of Directors or Executuve Committee elections, etc.):

_____ yes

_____ no

15. _____

16,17.

11. Date of your birth is _____/_____/_____*
month day year

*(If respondent does not wish to give his or her birthdate, please give your estimate of the respondent's age in the following space_____.)

12. How many times have County Extension Agents visited you at your home on Extension business during the past twelve months? (check one)

_____ 1 to 3 times

_____ more than 3 times

_____ none

18. _____

13. How often have you personally visited the County Extension office (4-H, Home Economics, or Agriculture, located on the 4th floor of the Federal Bldg., Watertown, N. Y.), during the past twelve months? (check one

_____ 1 to 3 times

_____ more than 3 times

_____ none

19. _____

14. During the past twelve months, the approximate total number of Extension activities (i.e. meetings, training schools, etc.), that you have personally attended is: (check one)

_____ less than 3

_____ 3 - 6

_____ 6 or more

_____ none

20.

21.

Extension Reorganization In Jefferson Co., N. Y. ———

PART II

The following questions concern the operation of the new Extension organization. Please check (✓) only one answer that you believe to be correct, for each question.

15. The basic requirement for membership in the Extension organization is: (check one)

_____ a. Payment of a fee.

_____ b. Being listed as a participant.

_____ c. Approval by vote of the Board of Directors.

_____ d. Do not know.

16. The main governing body of the new Extension organization is: (check one)

_____ a. The Division Executive Committee.

_____ b. The Board of Directors of the Association.

_____ c. The County Board of Supervisors.

_____ d. Do not know.

17. The principal function of the division executive committee is: (check one)

_____ a. Oversee and develop a division program.

_____ b. Secure finances and facilities.

_____ c. Employ the agents for the division.

_____ d. Do not know.

22.

23.

24.

25.

18. The number of representatives from the County Board of Supervisors on the Board of Directors of the new Extension Organization is: (check one) 26.

_____ a. One

_____ b. Two

_____ c. Three

_____ d. Do not know

19. The Administrative Committee is: (check one) 27.

_____ a. An agent staff committee.

_____ b. A committee of lay leaders.

_____ c. A committee of state level Extension employees.

_____ d. Do not know.

20. How many program divisions can there be established under the new Extension organization: (check one) 28.

_____ a. Only one

_____ b. One or more

_____ c. Three

_____ d. Do not know

21. The division executive committees have primary responsibility for: (check one) 29.

_____ a. Administrative and financial matters.

_____ b. Employment and personnel action.

_____ c. Program planning.

_____ d. Do not know.

22. The new organization: (check one) 30.

_____ a. Increased the number of persons on the Board of Directors.

_____ b. Permits the establishment of Inter-county programs.

_____ c. Decreased the number of persons on a division executive committee.

_____ d. Do not know.

23. Under the new organization five members of the Board of Directors are elected: (check one) 31.

_____ a. From each division executive committee.

_____ b. At-large by the County Association membership.

_____ c. By the division executive committee members.

_____ d. Do not know.

24. The president of the County Extension organization under the new system is elected: (check one) 32.

_____ a. By the Association membership.

_____ b. By the members of the division

_____ c. By the members of the Board of Directors.

_____ d. Do not know.

25. The chairman of the administrative committee serves as: (check one) 33.

_____ a. President of the Board of Directors

_____ b. Executive Secretary to the Board of Directors.

_____ c. Treasurer of the County Association.

_____ d. Do not know.

26. Under the new organization, the Extension finances will be handled: (check one)

_____ a. Through separate division program budgets

_____ b. Through one consolidated Extension budget for all divisions.

_____ c. Through a special finance division.

_____ d. Do not know.

34.

27. Under the new organization, a special program division may be established: (check one)

_____ a. By any one program division.

_____ b. By any two program divisions.

_____ c. Only with the approval of the Board of Directors.

_____ d. Do not know.

35.

28. How many members of each division executive committee serve on the Extension Board of Directors? (check one)

_____ a. Two

_____ b. Three

_____ c. Five

_____ d. Do not know.

36.

37.

29. The State Director of Extension designates how many members of his state staff to serve as voting member(s) of the Jefferson County Extension Board of Directors? (check one) 38.

_____ a. One

_____ b. Three

_____ c. None

_____ d. Do not know

30. Members of the Division Executive committees are elected by the: (check one) 39.

_____ a. Extension membership.

_____ b. Board of Directors.

_____ c. Members of each respective program division.

_____ d. Do not know.

31. The official name of the County Extension organization is: (check one)

_____ a. Jefferson County Extension Service Association.

_____ b. Cooperative Extension Association of Jefferson County.

_____ c. Agricultural Extension of Jefferson County.

_____ d. Do not know.

32. The minimum voting age limit for all currently enrolled Extension participants, including 4-H members is: (check one)

_____ a. 18 years

_____ b. 19 years

_____ c. 21 years

_____ d. Do not know

RESPONDENT'S ANSWER GUIDE to be used with Part III.

1. Agree fully
2. Tend to agree
3. Neutral - cannot say
4. Tend to disagree
5. Disagree fully

PART III

Opinion of the Extension Reorganization

Instructions for Interviewer:

1. Make sure you have put Part II in the manilla envelope before starting on Part III.

2. Read the following introduction to the respondent before asking any questions.

3. Explain the types of answers needed. Give the sheet of paper designating the answers to be used to the respondent for reference while answering the questions.

4. Read each statement as printed below. You may repeat the sentence as many times as necessary or explain a particular word, but please DO NOT alter the sentence structure.

5. For each question check (✓) only one answer as given by the respondent.

Introduction

The following statements are designed to obtain your opinion of the recent Extension reorganization. Your answers will be kept in strictest confidences and will be used only as a part of the total response. No references will be made in any way to identify an individual's answers.

The following statements are generalizations and represent probable opinions - not facts. As opinions, they are neither right or wrong. Agreement or disagreement will be determined largely by your personal experience. Please indicate your position to the statement in reference to what you believe at the present time, using the answers stated on the paper that I just gave to you.

BE SURE TO ASK RESPONDENT IF THERE ARE ANY QUESTIONS CONCERNING PROCEDURE OR INSTRUCTIONS.

33. The County Extension Association should offer programs to audiences other than just the rural and agricultural community. | 40.

_____ 1. Agree fully

_____ 2. Tend to agree

_____ 3. Neutral - cannot say

_____ 4. Tend to disagree

_____ 5. Disagree fully

34. The Association Board of Directors, rather than the program division executive committee, should have the power to approve or disapprove County Extension programs and policies. | 41.

_____ 1. Agree fully

_____ 2. Tend to agree

_____ 3. Neutral - cannot say

_____ 4. Tend to disagree

_____ 5. Disagree fully

35. The Extension reorganization was necessary to develop new Extension programs to meet the changing needs and problems of today's people. | 42.

_____ 1. Agree fully

_____ 2. Tend to agree

_____ 3. Neutral - cannot say

_____ 4. Tend to disagree

_____ 5. Disagree fully

36. The reorganization of Extension will strengthen the development of programs needed in Jefferson County. 43.

_____ 1. Agree fully

_____ 2. Tend to agree

_____ 3. Neutral - cannot say

_____ 4. Tend to disagree

_____ 5. Disagree fully

37. Any person currently enrolled in an Extension program and meeting the minimum voting age requirement of the Association should be entitled to full voting privileges regardless if the program requires a fee or not. 44.

_____ 1. Agree fully

_____ 2. Tend to agree

_____ 3. Neutral - cannot say

_____ 4. Tend to disagree

_____ 5. Disagree fully

38. Program division executive committees (4-H, Home Economics, and Agriculture) should assist with the hiring and evaluation of their respective Extension Agents, but final authority for all hiring and evaluation should rest with the Board of Directors. 45.

_____ 1. Agree fully

_____ 2. Tend to agree

_____ 3. Neutral - cannot say

_____ 4. Tend to disagree

_____ 5. Disagree fully

39. The primary responsibility of the program Division Executive Committees (4-H, Home Economics and Agriculture) should be to develop Extension programs for the county. 46.

_____ 1. Agree fully

_____ 2. Tend to agree

_____ 3. Neutral - cannot say

_____ 4. Tend to disagree

_____ 5. Disagree fully

40. A person from the office of the Director of the New York State Cooperative Extension should be a member of the county Extension Board of Directors with full voting rights. 47.

_____ 1. Agree fully

_____ 2. Tend to agree

_____ 3. Neutral - cannot say

_____ 4. Tend to disagree

_____ 5. Disagree fully

41. A supervisor from the Jefferson County Board of Supervisors should be a member of the County Extension Board of Directors with full voting rights. 48.

_____ 1. Agree fully

_____ 2. Tend to agree

_____ 3. Neutral - cannot say

_____ 4. Tend to disagree

_____ 5. Disagree fully

42. Extension members, eighteen years of age or older should be eligible to vote.

_____ 1. Agree fully

_____ 2. Tend to agree

_____ 3. Neutral - cannot say

_____ 4. Tend to disagree

_____ 5. Disagree fully

49. _____

VITA

Robert Andrew Boice was born in the Township of Milton, Saratoga County, New York on June 11, 1934. He attended the Rock City Falls Elementary School and the Saratoga Springs High School, graduating from high school in June 1952.

In September 1952 he entered the College of Agriculture at Cornell University, Ithaca, New York and on June 11, 1956 received the Bachelor of Science degree in Agriculture.

He began employment with the New York State Extension Service on June 18, 1956 as an Agent-at-large with the 4-H Department in Cayuga County. In October, 1956 he entered the U. S. Army and spent the major portion of his two year tour of duty on the west coast in the State of Washington. When released from the Army in July, 1958, he returned to employment with the New York State Extension Service as Agent-at-large and then as Assistant Agent with the 4-H Department in Delaware County.

On July 1, 1959, Mr. Boice began employment as County 4-H Club Agent assuming the responsibilities of department head. Except for a period of recall for active duty with the U. S. Army from November, 1961 to August, 1962 during the Berlin Crisis, he continued employment in Jefferson County as County 4-H Club Agent, now Cooperative Extension Agent-4-H. He has served as chairman of the Jefferson County Extension staff since appointed in June, 1964.

He was granted a ten month sabbatical leave for advanced study at Virginia Polytechnic Institute beginning September 1, 1966. On completing all of the course work and part of the thesis requirement for a Master's degree, he returned to his Extension position in Jefferson County at the end of June, 1967. In April 1968, he was granted a short term study leave to return to Virginia Polytechnic Institute to complete his thesis work.

He is married to the former Mary Kathryn Barck of Olympia, Washington. They have two children, a son, Randell Edward and a daughter, Kathryn Mary Anna.

Robert Andrew Boucie

A STUDY OF THE KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDES HELD BY COUNTY EXTENSION LAY LEADERS AND MEMBERS RELATIVE TO THE 1966 REORGANIZATION OF THE COOPERATIVE EXTENSION ASSOCIATION OF JEFFERSON COUNTY, NEW YORK

by

Robert Andrew Boice

ABSTRACT

In January, 1966, six counties in New York State reorganized their respective Cooperative Extension Service organizations. The Cooperative Extension Association of Jefferson County, one of the six, was chosen for this study.

Objectives of the study were to determine (1) levels of knowledge and attitude held by lay leaders and members of the Extension reorganization, (2) the relationships between the levels of knowledge and attitude of the leaders and members, and (3) the relationships of the levels of knowledge and attitude held by leaders and members when compared with certain variables.

The two groups studied consisted of all 36 leaders and a five percent sample of the Extension membership or 116 members. The instrument of observation was an interview-schedule. Data were obtained through personal interviews. Chi-square tests for significance were accepted at the .05 percent level. Findings included:

(1) Leaders had a significantly higher level of knowledge and a more favorable attitude of the Extension reorganization than members.

(2) Extension participation was significantly higher in the leader group than the member group.

(3) Attitude and knowledge were not significantly related to each other in either the member or leader groups.

(4) Knowledge of the Extension reorganization was not significantly related to the variables of age, education, sex, occupation, income, residence, tenure and Extension participation in either study group.

(5) In the member group, women had a significantly more favorable attitude toward the Extension reorganization. Sex was not significantly related to attitude in the leader group.

(6) None of the remaining variables of age, education, occupation, income, residence, tenure, and Extension participation were significantly related to attitude in the member or leader groups.

ERIC Clearinghouse
APR 6 1970
on